THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. I DECEMBER, 1920 No. 6

EDITORIAL

The year 1920 is likely to bulk large in the mind of future generations as decisive of great movements and events in the history of Christianity. When it opened, the anxieties and obscurities so marked in the political and economic spheres were no less noticeable in religion; and if in the former, with the fearful exception of Ireland, there are signs of a return to saner counsels in the general mind of the people, the Church has recovered the leadership which twelve months ago it seemed to lack. It has recovered it because the Spirit has been outpoured. The power of Christ so abundantly manifested in the Anglo-Catholic Congress, and so cordially recognized by many whose sympathies have never lain with the movement behind it, was an experience never to be forgotten by those who were there. It widened the whole horizon of English Churchmanship, and gave a new vision of the call and character of our Communion.

The fear that the Anglo-Catholic Congress might tend to deepen cleavages already existing was speedily dispelled by the Report of the Lambeth Conference, which testified to the authentic breath of the same Spirit, Catholic, Evangelical, and free; and, though many of its Resolutions have been and will be subjected to much discussion and criticism, we need not fear the process in the new atmosphere which has been created. The happiest auguries of it were to be discovered in the Church Congress at Southend, especially in the Presidential Address. We referred in our last number to the probable connection of the Bishop of Chelmsford's constructive proposals with the Conference held at Cuddesdon last September; and we are glad to be able to publish this month an account of the issues lying behind that Conference from the pen of one who took part in it. The article represents the writer's own view, but it has been seen, and its publication approved, by some of those chiefly concerned.

Our own position on the main substance of the article may be defined as follows:

1. The article makes the large assumption that an external and living authority in matters of religious belief exists. We believe this assumption to be well-founded—as indeed a necessary corollary of an historic Incarnation.

2. Granted that an external and living authority exists, we desire to know what is its relation to Scripture, and what *intrinsic* guarantees (as distinct from the restraints of circumstance) are contained in it for the maintenance of freedom.

3. We accept the contention that the appellate court of religious authority cannot be restricted to the first four, six, or even eleven centuries, and see in it a welcome application to theology of principles long since accepted in every other branch of science; and we regard the distinction between later decisions of the separated branches of the Church which have been, and those which have not been, rejected by other branches as a new and valuable contribution to the solution of the problem.

4. We would urge that a further distinction needs to be drawn between those practices which have arisen spontaneously from the pastoral life of local or national areas within the Roman Communion and those which owe their inception or encouragement to the special exercise of central power. We have no sympathy whatever with the methods of the Curia or of the Jesuits, and we are disposed to believe that the most fruitful developments in the Roman Church of the last 300 years are precisely those which are least connected with either.

The year has been noticeable for some outstanding theological books. Some of these have already been reviewed in our pages, of which one, published in 1919—Dr. Rashdall's *Bampton Lectures*—will call for study and discussion for many years to come, traversing as it does every period of Christian life and thought in the past. Of similar lasting interest is the Rev. O. D. Watkins's *History of Penance* (Longmans, 42s.). Among commentaries, Canon Parry's edition of *The Pastoral Epistles* and Dr. Charles's *Revelation* (International Critical Commentary, 2 vols., 40s.) take a high place. Two books especially deal with Christianity in action. Mr. C. E. Raven's *Christian Socialism*, 1848-1854 (Macmillan, 17s.), is an inspiring record of great men hitherto too little recognized and of a movement whose fruits are not yet fully harvested, and it will appeal to all who believe that Christian principles can be, and should be, applied to social and industrial life. It has been followed at short interval by a valuable discussion of the application of Christianity to the

moral and spiritual life of believers, the work of Mr. K. E. Kirk, Fellow of Magdalen College and Tutor of Keble College, Oxford. In *Some Principles of Moral Theology* (Longmans, 15s.) Mr. Kirk has done much to wipe away the reproach which was confessed by the Lambeth Conference when it pointed to the lack of guidance given to clergy in their primary work of the cure of souls. We intend to publish in the immediate future a short series of articles on Moral Theology by Mr. Kirk, which will, we hope, serve to introduce them to his book itself.

Finally, and by no means least important, the Dean of Wells's *Barnabas, Hermas, and the Didache* (S.P.C.K., 6s.) bids fair to solve one of the *cruces* of early Christian literature. The Dean presents a careful examination of the three books named in the title, the result being to dispose of the accepted theory of a Jewish manual on the "Two Ways," which was supposed to have been embodied in *Barnabas* and in the *Didache*. The original "Two Ways" is shown to be that which we find in *Barnabas;* as such, it was known to and used by the author of *The Shepherd* in the middle of the second century; while still later the writer of the *Didache* found in it just the material he needed for his fanciful enterprise of reconstructing the kind of teaching which he supposed to have been prevalent in the apostolic age. Thus, Harnack's hypothesis of three strata in the literary evolution of the *Didache*—viz., first, a Jewish "Two Ways"; secondly, a Christianized "Two Ways" with additional instruction on Church institutions; and, thirdly, the book as we know it—is seen to be unnecessary; the facts are sufficiently explained without resort to postulated documents. As the Dean says: "If even half of what I have put forward be admitted by serious students, the pen must be drawn through many a sentence, and indeed through whole pages, of some recent descriptions of early Church life and organization." Both author and publishers are to be congratulated on offering us so momentous a work in so moderate a compass.

THE CHRISTIAN USE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN THE PRESENT DAY

How are Christians to use the Old Testament in the present day? The question has often been asked, and it has been answered in various ways which have brought relief to anxious minds. At the same time, it is not a question which can be dismissed as settled once for all. Fresh light is continually arriving, and, as we learn to understand the Old Testament better, we ought to be improving our interpretation of it in a Christian sense. Movement and revision are wholesome signs of life in biblical study. The important thing is to cultivate an eye for the essentials; we shall then see how to find a place for new truth as it becomes clear to us.

Now, it may be maintained, with some degree of justice, that the Old Testament owes its preservation in the Church to the mystical sense in which it was understood; hence many Christians feel that, if the scientific study of the Bible requires them to give up this mystical interpretation, they may as well give up the use of the Old Testament altogether. Let us look into the argument.

Primarily, we imagine, the Old Testament owes its preservation in the Christian Church to the fact that the Church was Jewish to begin with, and claimed to be continuous with the Israel of old, the heir of its hopes and promises, and the owner of its sacred writings. The first Christians made use of the Old Testament because it was part of their heritage, not merely because it gave support to their faith in the Messiahship of Jesus. The writers of the New Testament treat the Old exactly as any devout Jew would treat it, with this difference, however: they had discovered the clue to its meaning simply by following the direction to which it pointed. With time and study they found more and more of Christ in the ancient Scriptures; and as the New Testament took shape and came to be regarded as inspired, the Old Testament increased in estimation, and the two were looked upon as forming an inseparable whole. By the second century A.D. Irenæus can say: "God did not teach that the one Testament offered old truths and the other new truths, but He taught that they were one and the same."* Broadly speaking, the principle still holds good, though we should be inclined to emphasize growth where Irenæus saw only continuity.

It is when we come to interpretation in detail that we are confronted with a very real difficulty. Modern biblical science compels

* *Hær.* iv. 18: Non alterum quidem vetera, alterum vero proferentem nova docuit; sed unum et eundem (commenting on Matt. xiii. 52).

us to scrutinize in a fresh light the Christian interpretation which has become more or less traditional. Our historical conscience has been quickened, and we cannot stifle its voice. If we have not even yet learned the lesson which Matthew Arnold tried to drive home in *Literature and Dogma*, at any rate we are alive to the danger of translating the language of the imagination into the formulæ of a creed; we are beginning to appreciate the ancient Scriptures as literature in a way which our forefathers hardly knew.

What, then, is to happen when we apply our method of historical and literary criticism? The disappearance, let us admit at once, of a mass of artificial exegesis, supposing that we have made up our minds to find out what the Scriptures really mean, rather than what we wish them to mean. A recent writer has alluded to "the Church's exasperating habit of telling little lies in support of a great truth." The Old Testament needs no petty falsehoods of exegesis to support its witness. We may be compelled to give up allegories and fancies which devout minds have cherished, and we must make the sacrifice, no matter how venerable the sanction or how widespread the usage may be. We want to get at the truth, and to nourish our souls on the truth.

A few instances may be given to illustrate our point. In former days the typology of the Old Testament was looked upon as the very key to its higher Christian meaning; but none of the Bible Dictionaries which have recently appeared contains a single article on the subject, so great has been the change in our ways of thinking —a change wholly to the good. The liturgical use of the Old Testament shows no such improvement as yet; why should our critical faculties be needlessly provoked when we are in church? On Trinity Sunday we have to listen to the story of the three "angels" in Gen. xviii.; it is a superb narrative, but how can we be expected to apply this crude folk-lore, only partially cleansed of its polytheism, to the mystery of the Three in One? Possibly we may defend the use of Ps. lxviii. for Whit Sunday on the ground that it celebrates the triumphs of a great campaign, but no doubt it was St. Paul's mistranslation of verse 19, "thou hast given gifts unto men" (Eph. iv. 8), which suggested the connexion with Pentecost; not that we have any right to blame St. Paul, for he is merely adapting the verse to give a scriptural turn to his language. The forty-fifth Psalm, again, was understood by the Jews, and consequently by the Christian Church, to refer to the Messiah. It has many charms of colour and fancy; but its Messianic application rests upon a text which is probably corrupt: the most enthusiastic Hebrew poet would not dare to address his prince with "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever"; and how can we bring ourselves to read a Christian sense into an Oriental epithalamium? The question arises again in

connexion with the Song of Songs, that "most lovely song," as the title means, and there is nothing lovelier in the Old Testament. We follow entranced the fortunes of the young lovers, we revel in the poetry of the spring; the pure in heart can see God in both; but we decline to pervert this idyll into a description of the mystical union betwixt Christ and His Church, or of the sacred gifts in the Eucharist. One more instance of false exegesis may be mentioned because it occurs among the Proposals for the Revision of the Prayer Book lately put out by Convocation (p. 36). The passage, Gen. iii. 9-15, which announces the curse on the serpent, is proposed for the Epistle on the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin (September 8). It is bad enough that we have to read this as a lesson for the feast of the Annunciation: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed; he [*i.e.* the seed] shall bruise thy head, and thou shalt bruise his heel." Abundant authority, from the Targums onwards, supports the Messianic interpretation; the misleading name of *Protevangelium* was given to the verse, no one seems to know exactly when; Irenæus taught a reference to the Person of Christ;* medieval exegesis, led astray by the Vulgate's "ipsa conteret caput tuum," insisted upon an allusion to the Blessed Virgin; and so the falsehood grew. The passage speaks only of enmity; no victory is promised to either side; what lies behind the language is, we may suppose, the instinctive loathing for the reptile felt by healthy-minded people.

These, however, are comparatively small things; one feels almost ashamed of dwelling upon them in connexion with the mysteries of the Christian faith. But it is time that we uttered a protest in the name of biblical science and common honesty. The Old Testament, so full of splendid literature and heroic faith and heavenly promises, has been abused out of recognition: let us get rid of this triviality and perversion! But, we shall be told, if you give up the traditional Christian interpretation, you may as well give up the use of the Old Testament altogether. The problem weighs on the minds of a good many people, and we must try to deal with it.

We will begin by pointing out that the Christian use of the Old Testament has varied greatly through the centuries. Each age had its own methods of interpretation, and applied them in detail according to its own light. The only principle which has remained constant all the time is the fundamental one—that the Old Testament as a whole leads up to and is fulfilled in Christ. The New Testament itself illustrates both ways of using the ancient Scriptures: the one in accordance with the fashion of the day, the other on a principle which may be called permanent. All the writers of the New Testament were convinced that the Old pointed to Christ, though they

* *Hær.* iv. 65; v. 61.

appeal to it with different aims in view: the Evangelists and the author of Hebrews to show how it foretold the earthly and the heavenly life of Christ; St. Paul, St. Peter, and the Apocalypse, to show how it is fulfilled in the Church of Christ. These are so many different applications of the principle upon which, at all times, the Church has made use of the ancient Scriptures. But the New Testament writers also reveal that other kind of usage which belongs to their own age, and is determined by the accidents of their temper and training. We can think of many quotations by which the Evangelists seek to corroborate details in the history of our Lord: "Out of Egypt have I called my son;" "The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up;" "Behold, thy king cometh unto thee, meek and riding upon an ass;" "A bone of him shall not be broken;" "They shall look on him whom they pierced." These references betray the loving enthusiasm, the child-like wonder, with which the first believers read the Scriptures afresh in the light of their great experience; but we can no more use the Old Testament as they did than we can recover the emotion of those early days. Again, take the case of St. Paul. He has a profound insight into the deeper sense of the Old Testament: what can be more masterly than his handling of the relation of the Law to the Gospel, or of the new Israel to the old? The large issues are what interest him; but when he is engaged in controversy with Jews he meets them with Jewish arguments founded on word-play, allegory, unnatural interpretations. Probably it was most effective for the purpose; but Rabbinic exegesis has had its day, and carries no conviction with it now.

Yet Rabbinic influences can be traced, long after St. Paul's time, in the practice of allegorical interpretation which the Church adopted for centuries. It was "the favourite method of men of vision," as Philo says; he set the fashion, and the Jewish schools followed him, and after them the Christian. In the sub-apostolic Church we find the practice already well established, with the extraordinary results that appear in the Epistle of Barnabas.* By the time of Clement of Alexandria and of Origen what strikes us is not the use of allegorism and typology, because everyone adopted it, but the extent to which it was pushed and the novel purposes which it was made to serve. Every student of the Bible must feel unbounded respect for the labours of Origen on the sacred text; and it may be allowed that his system of interpretation was an earnest attempt to face the moral difficulties of the Old Testament, and to explain them, or explain them away, in the light of Christian truth. But the general effect was to turn the least important parts of

* To give a more favourable specimen: Moses, when he broke the tablets of the Law, symbolized the dissolution of the old covenant and its transference to Christians.—*Barn. Ep.*, xiv.

Scripture into the most important, on the lines of "everything is nothing, and nothing is everything." Sometimes the consequences were particularly unfortunate. Clement of Rome was the first, it seems, to treat the Jewish priest and Levite as types of the Christian presbyter and deacon, but Origen worked out the analogy in elaborate detail,* and later teachers pressed it further still, a curious instance of the perversion of Scripture itself, for the Epistle to the Hebrews not only abolishes the Levitical priesthood, but refuses to allow it to be even a type of the true priesthood which our Lord fulfilled. The allegorical mode of interpretation depends, in fact, as Dr. Bigg has pointed out,† upon two incompatible conditions—a belief in the verbal inspiration of the ancient writings, and a desire to adapt them to the needs of a later age. We no longer believe in verbal inspiration; and the method of allegorism only serves now to illustrate those passing fashions which have marked the Christian use of the Old Testament.

When we turn to the medieval Western Church, we notice, of course, the influence of the Old Latin and Vulgate versions. It is impossible to calculate the effect of such renderings as "et veniet Desideratus cunctis gentibus" (Hag. ii. 7), or "Dominus regnavit a ligno" (Ps. xcv. [xcvi.] 10, *O.L.*), or of such an idea as that contained in "Corde natus ex Parentis," extracted out of the first line of Ps. xliv. [xlv.]. These magnificent mistranslations, some of them set like gems in the splendid hymns of the Church, appeal strongly to our imagination. We listen with awe to the tones of "teste David cum Sybilla," without allowing ourselves to criticize an application of Scripture which was bound to disappear when the text came to be studied in a form nearer to the original. It will be sufficient merely to indicate the change brought about in the sixteenth century. The publication of the Greek text by Erasmus in 1516, by which, as it was said at the time, "the New Testament shone with a new light"; the Latin translation of the Hebrew Old Testament by Sebastian Munster in 1534, and the German translation by Luther in the same year; our own Great Bible of 1539–41; and, among commentaries, the work of Calvin (1509–64), the greatest work done on the Old Testament in the age of the Reformation—all these made it possible for the ordinary Christian to seek and find for himself, unfettered by the accumulation of centuries.

This rapid survey, incomplete though it be, shows how greatly the Christian use of the Old Testament has varied down the ages. The fundamental principle, that the Old Testament is fulfilled in Christ and in the Church of Christ, remains unaltered, but with a wide margin of change in the interpretation of details. What seemed

* I. Clement, *ad Cor.*, xl.-xliv.; Origen, *in Lev. Hom.*, v. 3.
† *Origins of Christianity*, p. 426.

true and precious to one age of the Church proved unsatisfying to another, so that when we seek to read the Old Testament by the clearest light that is given to us, we are only doing what the Church has always done. We shall find Christ there, but perhaps in a new sense, all the more real to us because it fits in with what we have learnt of God's plan in history and revelation.

Let us now consider the question with which we started. How is a Christian to use the Old Testament in the present day? First of all, he will use it to explore the history of his religion. As distinct from other great faiths, Christianity is founded upon certain historical facts; we cannot get away from them, however much some may wish to do so—indeed, the instinct of the Church has always been to hold fast to them, as to a sheet-anchor. And these historical facts naturally presuppose others. Christianity, as Dr. Hamilton puts it, is "the religion of the Jews reorganized by Jesus the Messiah."* It may be gathered from St. Peter and St. Paul that the first believers would state their position in some such way as this, to quote Dr. Hamilton again: "We are the community of the Messiah, and therefore the true Israelites."† What is meant by the Messiah? Who were the Israelites? We must go to the Old Testament for an answer. But it may be said that the average Christian cannot be expected to investigate the antecedents of his faith, as a theologian is bound to do, and that the Old Testament may well be left to students of theology. Yet "real history is worth establishing wherever possible," and there are such people as thoughtful Christians who desire to ascertain the facts; they will find it possible to be loyal both to their faith and to their intelligence if they will use the Old Testament to discover the early stages of God's self-disclosure.

But we must come to the higher values. In the current presentation of religion we are apt to be too much concerned with past history, and not enough with living experience. An investigation of the background has its proper time and place, but it can never meet the case of people with hunger in their souls and a sense of pressing needs. What can the Old Testament mean to them? It leads them, we maintain, to the foundation of all true religion. Where else can be found, stated with such variety and practical force, the essential truths that God is One, that He is the Creator of everything, righteous and demanding righteousness, unapproachable in holiness, yet the Father of His people, patient with them, and mighty to save? The New Testament takes over the great axioms and carries them to their full conclusions. Moreover, we must begin somewhere; the teacher of children, the missionary

* *The People of God*, vol. ii., p. 18.
† *Ibid*, p. 31.

among the heathen, knows the danger of putting at the beginning what properly belongs to the end. The large human element in the Old Testament makes it an incomparable textbook for teaching the fundamentals of religion, provided that it is used in a human way, and with some feeling for literature. The old stories can be made to yield many practical lessons; let us be careful, however, to start from the real sense of the original.

In the next place we must consider those parts of the Old Testament which point more directly to Christ: how is the Christian of the present day to understand them? The question naturally requires us to turn our attention for a moment to the subject of prophecy, which modern study may be said to have rediscovered, or at any rate brought back to life. Formerly great stress used to be laid upon the fulfilment of the prophecies, and they certainly contain an element of direct prediction; the overthrow of Sennacherib, for example, and the Babylonian exile came about as the prophets declared they would; but to a remarkable degree, perhaps even as a rule, the event did not correspond with the anticipation. This is most significant. Age after age looked out for the establishment of the ideal State, the arrival of the righteous ruler, the glorification of Israel, the homage of the Gentiles; age after age was disappointed, and yet clung to its hope. For the prophetic oracles remained still so much alive that each generation found it possible to adapt them or expand them to suit fresh circumstances, which originally had never come within the prophet's view. The ideals, in fact, were too large to be realized at once, or in the way at first imagined. Sometimes they were connected with the expectation of a righteous prince or judge or priest, but more often this was not the case. If we include the Psalms and Apocalypses with the prophetical books, we shall find that Messianic prophecy, as we call it, is occupied with something more than direct predictions of a person; these hold a subordinate place. The main characteristic is a certain attitude towards the future, with the gaze fixed upon the kingdom of God, the working out of God's purpose, the union of God with man.

Yet the personal element must not be overlooked, and to appreciate it we should notice how the perplexity caused by Israel's excessive sufferings gained some measure of relief. National disasters forced the problem to the front; it pressed most heavily upon the inner circle of the faithful, the loyal minority. No doubt in Jeremiah, in some of the Psalms, in Job, we hear the cries of an individual sufferer, yet in all three there are moments when the individual is not thinking of himself alone; he is the mouthpiece of the community of the faithful, the true Israel, which is struggling to think out the meaning of its pains. And to a few prophetic minds,

as in Isa. liii. and Ps. xxii., it was given to see that Israel's sufferings might preach to the world as nothing else would, and proclaim the true religion, and even be accepted almost as a sacrifice on behalf of a hostile, persecuting world.

It is this larger conception of prophecy which we are learning to apprehend. We would lay stress on the whole direction of the religious longings, the whole substance of the ideals, which demand for their satisfaction that which Christ alone can bring. Many of them our Lord adopted as His own; many of them remain still unfulfilled in the Christian as in the Jewish age. Perhaps it may be thought that this change of emphasis substitutes vague ideals for definite predictions; but our aim must be to get rid of vagueness, and make the ideals living and distinct. What appear to be definite predictions may be easier to grasp, but these are, comparatively speaking, the lesser things; Messianic prophecy is something wider and deeper.

Lastly, the Christian who desires to learn how to use the Old Testament cannot do better than study the way in which our Lord Himself uses it. As we examine His quotations and applications—these, it is generally agreed, are among the most authentic of His sayings—our attention is diverted from the small things to the great. A load is lifted off our minds. It is like going out of the close atmosphere of a crowded room into the freshness of the open air. As a result of our study we shall be led to conclusions which may be summarized briefly as follows:*

(*a*) Our Lord looks at the Old Testament in the light of His day. He appeals to it in a manner which His contemporaries would understand, congenial to the thought of the time. In His treatment of it He neither adopts the method of a former age, nor anticipates a later point of view; He argues from premises common to Himself and to the keen Bible-students who listened to Him. May we not reverently follow His example in treating the Old Testament according to the best light we have, and in a way which is convincing to us at the present time?

(*b*) He uses a freedom, an authority, towards certain parts which astonishes us, as it astonished His hearers. Some things He regards as out of date and superseded; certain laws, designed for a vanished order, are no longer binding; details of historical narratives are ignored. This sovereign freedom belongs, of course, to Christ alone—no one else can have the right to exercise it; but we may learn from Him to cultivate a sense of proportion or of

* The writer wishes to acknowledge his debt to Dr. McNeile's admirable essay, "Our Lord's Use of the O.T." in *Cambridge Biblical Essays*, 1909, where full illustrations are given. See also Dr. McNeile's *O.T. in the Christian Church*, S.P.C.K., 1913.

relative values, and to trace in the record of Israel's history and institutions the stages of a progressive revelation. Those parts of the Old Testament which belong to a period of morals long since outgrown should be frankly given up, without making any attempt to force them into an edifying sense.

(*c*) Only such elements in the Old Testament as fell into line with His purpose, such as were capable of development, He adopted and emphasized. That kingdom of God which the prophets had greeted from afar He made central in His teaching. With a startling boldness of application He even identified Himself with Israel as prophetically idealized, that is, with the Israel whose sufferings could only be accounted for by supposing that in some way they were vicarious and redemptive; with the Israel also who appeared in Daniel's vision as the son of man, destined to found a permanent kingdom and an authority as wide as the world.*

It was, then, the ideals of the prophets which our Lord took over from the Old Testament, particularly those which still await fulfilment. As to the Law, He declared that not one jot or one tittle should pass from it till all things be accomplished (Matt. v. 18). We have just noticed that He discarded certain portions of the Law, but clearly not the whole of it. For underlying the system, as it grew out of primitive custom into a fully elaborated code, can be traced a slow but persevering effort to " advance from righteousness to holiness."† Therein lies the spiritual principle capable of further development, and He insisted that it should be developed to the full.

So far we have been thinking of quotations or allusions; but a good deal of our Lord's use of the Old Testament may be described as probably unconscious or instinctive. The Hebrew Scriptures furnished Him with the language of religion, which rises to His lips when He is speaking prophetically of the last things, and when, in the Passion, He utters the cries of the saints as He knew them from the Psalms. But it is the Evangelists, not our Lord, who apply the twenty-second Psalm to the incidents of the Passion, and find in the Old Testament descriptions or phrases which struck them as prophetic. Our Lord Himself is concerned with the wider issues, with principles and not externals; and if we wish to catch the inner spirit and direction of the Old Testament as a whole, we shall try to use it as He did. Now and again—the reserve is noticeable—He opens our eyes to a mystical sense in Scripture where we should never have suspected it, as, for example, in the quotation from Exod. iii. 6, and its comment, " God is not the God of the dead, but of the living "

* Isa. l. 4-9; lii. 13 to liii. Dan. vii. 13, 14, 27.

† See Nairne, *The Faith of the O.T.*, chap. iii., from which the writer has adopted several valuable suggestions.

(Matt. xxii. 32). There are depths, then, to be discovered below the surface; not, however, by mere play of fancy, but by a spiritual insight disciplined and quickened by the faithful search for truth.

Biblical science in recent years has done much to make the Old Testament more intelligible and full of living interest than it used to be. Difficulties have been cleared away to make room for an interpretation which shall be true both to history and to religion. So far from finding ourselves driven to give up the use of the Old Testament, we are learning to use it better, and to see how, more unmistakably than ever, it points the way to the life and teaching of our Lord.

G. A. Cooke.

RELIGIOUS CONVERSION AND MODERN PSYCHOLOGY

I.—CONVERSION

There are two methods of approaching the psychological treatment of conversion: (1) The method which tries to show its relation to the psychic mechanisms revealed by the study of such events in secular psychology as the outbreak of neuroses and dreams; (2) the method which emphasizes particularly its usual contiguity with the physiological and mental disturbances of puberty.

This close connection between conversion and adolescence was first pointed out by Dr. G. S. Hall, and has been most fully illustrated in Starbuck's well-known work, *The Psychology of Religion*. These authors point out that the majority of conversions take place between the ages of twelve and twenty-five. They therefore connect the conversion change with the physiological and psychological changes taking place at that time. The exceptions to the rule that conversions occur at adolescence cannot be accounted for in this way. Writers on religious psychology are, therefore, inclined to neglect such cases, and to content themselves with the formula: "Conversion is an adolescent phenomenon." This omission, however, is made a serious one by the importance of these exceptions in history. A large number of great religious leaders have been converted late in life. St. Paul, St. Augustine, and Tolstoy are well-known examples.

It appears preferable, therefore, to treat adult and adolescent conversions as two separate problems, and to see how far the explanations found for one will fit the other, and how far they require a different treatment.

The Mechanism of Adult Conversion

The psychological theory which gives most insight into the mechanism of conversion is that one which attaches importance, in the determination of conduct, to sentiments with a strong emotional tone which are repressed from the conscious mind.* Such repressed sentiments are now commonly called "complexes." The motive of this repression may be that the sentiment concerned is painful, immoral, or otherwise displeasing to the normal consciousness. The repression may be so complete that the repressed sentiment becomes entirely unknown to the conscious mind. The force opposed by the personality to the undesirable sentiment is called a "resistance." Though it is lost to consciousness, the repressed complex has not necessarily lost its power. It may influence conduct in some unexpected way. In this case, the individual concerned will be entirely ignorant of the source of this influence.

A familiar instance of the working of repression may serve to make these points clear. There is, both in fiction and in real life, a well-marked type of woman whose normal instincts have been unsatisfied. Because the deepest tragedies most easily amuse superficial persons, they have been given the half-humorous name of "old maids." This name is most commonly connected with unmarried women of middle age, whose most marked characteristics are prudery and a fondness for animals. Both of these features can be explained as results of the repression of the sexual and maternal instincts. The resistance shows itself by an exaggerated hostility to anything even remotely connected with sex—*i.e.*, in prudery. The tenderness which belongs to the repressed instincts, however, comes out in a distorted form as an excessive fondness for her animals. If the distorted expression of what is repressed takes a form which is generally considered to be, in itself, valuable, the process of expression is generally called "sublimation." Unmarried women who devote their energy to the care of slum children, or in similar social work, provide examples of sublimation.

The struggle between a complex and the opposing resistance, if both are conscious, will be present to consciousness as a painful mental conflict. If the complex is entirely unconscious this will not be the case, but there will still be a real conflict, although it is not present to the conscious mind. The time may come when the

* Readers familiar with the phraseology of modern psychology will remember that the word "sentiment" is used by Shand to mean an organized system of emotional tendencies centred about some object—*e.g.*, loyalty to a particular cause, or love for a particular person. "Repression" is the process of banishment from the mind of sentiments, memories, etc., which are painful to the mind as a whole. It differs from deliberate forgetting in the fact that it is carried out unwittingly.

resistance is no longer powerful enough to keep the complex repressed. There is then an outbreak into consciousness of something, such as a system of beliefs, which seems to have had no period of development in the mind. The system seems to have come to the mind from outside, so its outbreak has an apparently supernatural character. This appearance of the extramental origin of the system is, of course, an illusion, and is due to the fact that its incubation was unconscious.

Similar cases of unconscious incubation of mental constructions are familiar in ordinary life to everyone who is sufficiently introspective to have noticed them. Many people, when worried by a problem or by the necessity of writing a difficult letter, have the habit of dismissing it from their minds and returning to it later. They then find that, though they have not thought of it at all during the interval, the problem is solved or the letter seems "to write itself."

We are now in a position to see how the facts of conversion fit in with the theory that it is the product of a repressed complex. We may take, as a typical instance, the conversion of St. Paul. The psychological explanation of this has been discussed with admirable clearness by Dr. Jung in an article in the *Journal of the Society for Psychical Research*.* We will give this account in Dr. Jung's own words:

"Although the moment of a conversion seems sometimes quite sudden and unexpected, yet we know from repeated experience that such a fundamental occurrence always has a long period of unconscious incubation. It is only when the preparation is complete, that is to say, when the individual is ready to be converted, that the new view breaks forth with great emotion. St. Paul had already been a Christian for a long time, but unconsciously; hence his fanatical resistance to the Christians, because fanaticism exists chiefly in individuals who are compensating for secret doubts. The incident of his hearing the voice of Christ on his way to Damascus marks the moment when the unconscious complex of Christianity became conscious. That the auditory phenomenon should represent Christ is explained by the already existing unconscious Christian complex. The complex, being unconscious, was projected by St. Paul on to the external world as if it did not belong to him. Unable to conceive of himself as a Christian, and on account of his resistance to Christ, he became blind, and could only regain his sight through submission to a Christian, that is to say, through his complete submission to Christianity. Psychogenic blindness is, according to my experience, always due to an unwillingness to see, *i.e.* [to

* "The Psychological Foundation of Belief in Spirits," *Proc. S.P.R.*, May, 1920.

understand and to accept, what is incompatible with the conscious attitude. This was obviously the case with St. Paul. His unwillingness to see corresponds with his fanatical resistance to Christianity. This resistance was never wholly extinguished, a fact of which we have proof in the epistles. It broke forth at times in the fits he suffered from. It is certainly a great mistake to call his fits epileptic. There is no trace of epilepsy in them; on the contrary, St. Paul himself in his epistles gives hints enough as to the real nature of the illness. They are clearly psychogenic fits, which really mean a return to the old Saul-complex, repressed through conversion, in the same way as there had previously been a repression of the complex of Christianity."

Acceptance of this as an accurate account of the psychological mechanism of conversion does not, of course, prevent us from holding, if we have reason to do so, that there was an objective ground for St. Paul's visions. Psychologically, it is not a necessary postulate. It is arguable that it may be necessary on other grounds.

The conversion of St. Paul is particularly instructive, because it shows the unconscious complex breaking into consciousness as a result of its own development. The actual outbreak is not caused by an external influence, as in the case of a person converted by a revival sermon. Moreover, the resistance itself is visible in its effects on his conduct (in his persecution of the Christians). In most cases, it can only be an inference from the cataclysmic character of the change.

There seems to be, however, no reason for supposing that the ordinary adult conversion differs in its mechanism from this. We find that it may be adequately explained by assuming the presence of a growing sentiment, kept unconscious by a resistance, which finally overthrows that resistance and establishes itself in a dominant position in the conscious life.

The nature of the underlying complex and of the resistance may vary widely. Writers on religious psychology distinguish two classes of conversion which obviously have their roots in radically different conflicts. These are ordinary conversion (from an irreligious to a religious life) and what is generally called "mystical conversion" (from an ordinary religious life to the life of a mystic).

Ordinary conversion itself varies considerably in the nature of the resistance and the impulse which it is opposing. The conflict may be mainly moral, mainly intellectual, or mainly social. By a social conflict is meant one in which the contending interests are loyalties to two mutually opposed communities. It is likely that all three of these elements enter into every conversion, but it is possible to make a rough distinction into classes in which one or other of them is dominant.

The first class, in which the conflict is moral, is the most familiar, since most of the reported conversions of revival preachers are of this type. The repressed complex may be a desire to escape from excessive drinking or from sexual indulgence, or any other practice which is regarded as sinful. The interest behind the complex may be genuinely religious in character, a desire to "be right with God." This interest is often, however, supplemented or replaced by others, by a wish for the approval of other people or of one's self, by a fear of the consequences of continued indulgence, etc.* This is recognized by the revival preacher who, in addition to the purely religious appeal, eloquently describes the horrors of a drunkard's end or the pains of hell.

Thus, Jonathan Edwards says: "There will be no end to the exquisite, horrible misery. The inhabitants of heaven and all the universe will look on and praise God's justice. No prayer will mitigate God's hate and contempt, for He can no longer pity. You would have gone to hell last night had he not held you like a loathsome spider over the flames by a thread."†

We will take two examples of this type of conversion. Both are given in a book called *Stories of Grace*, by the Rev. C. S. Isaacson.

The first of these took place after a sermon preached in a small church in Basingstoke.

"Amongst the crowd in the centre of the aisle there stood a man so noted for his ungodliness and profane language as to be known in Basingstoke by the name of 'Swearing Tom.' He was a leader in sin and profanity, and for seventeen years he had never entered a church. It was only curiosity which brought him now. The text was taken from the prophecy of Ezekiel, 'I will put a new spirit within you.' Towards the close of the sermon the preacher quoted the words, 'If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask Him?' (Luke xi. 13), remarking that, contrary to the conclusion which might have been expected, 'the offer was not to children, but simply to those who asked. There was nothing, therefore, between the worst of men and this most blessed gift from heaven but to ask for it.' He then added, 'If the most wicked man in this church would go home and pray that God, for Christ's sake, would give him His Holy Spirit to change his heart, God would hear and answer that man's prayer.'

"These words went straight to the heart of 'Swearing Tom.'

* In sexual indulgence one of these interests is, no doubt, of instinctive origin. Some of the psycho-analysts have pointed out that it is incorrect to speak as if unlimited indulgence were "natural," while restraint is always a "work of grace." Excessive sexual indulgence is as truly a violation of an instinct as is absolute continence.

† "Sinners in the Hands of an Angry God," *Works*, 1807, vol. vii., p. 486.

'I am the worst man here,' he said to himself; 'I will go home and pray.' As he went he had to pass by the familiar public-house, but, unmoved by the calls of his companions, he refused to turn in. On reaching his home he threw himself on his knees, and tried to pray in the words which he had heard from the pulpit. The prayer was answered. From that time he became a changed man, and his name of 'Swearing Tom' was soon altered to that of 'Praying Tom,' by which he was known till the day of his death."

The next account is that given of himself by Mr. Brownlow North, who became, after his conversion, a revival preacher. He was of noble birth, and up to the age of forty-five he led a gay life in Aberdeen.

"It pleased God, in the month of November, 1854, one night, when I was sitting playing at cards, to make me concerned about my soul. The instrument used was a sensation of sudden illness, which led me to think that I was going to die. I said to my son, 'I am a dead man; take me upstairs.' As soon as this was done, I threw myself down on the bed. My first thought then was, 'Now, what will my forty-four years of following the devices of my own heart profit me? In a few minutes I shall be in hell, and what good will all these things do me for which I have sold my soul?' At that moment I felt constrained to pray, but it was merely the prayer of a coward, a cry for mercy.

"I was not sorry for what I had done, but I was afraid of the punishment of my sin. And yet there was something trying to prevent me putting myself on my knees to call for mercy, and that was the presence of the maidservant in the room, lighting the fire. Though I did not believe at that time I had ten minutes to live, and knew that there was no possible hope for me but in the mercy of God, and that if I did not seek that mercy I could not expect to have it, yet such was the nature of my heart, and of my spirit within me, that it was a balance with me, a thing to turn this way or that, I could not tell how, whether I should wait till that woman left the room, or whether I should fall on my knees and call for mercy in her presence.

"By the grace of God I did put myself on my knees before that girl, and I believe it was the turning-point with me."*

On the following day Mr. North announced publicly that he was a changed man, but this event was followed by a severe and prolonged period of conflict, which affected his health. The conscious element in this conflict was a conviction that he was the chief of sinners, and that there could be no hope for him.

The conflict ended one night when he was reading and came to the passage: 'But now the righteousness of God without the law is

* Brownlow North: *Records and Recollections.*

manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets; even the righteousness of God which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all and upon all them that believe.' " With that passage light came into my soul. Striking the book with my hand and springing from my chair, I cried, ' If that scripture is true, I am a saved man ! That is what I want; that is what God offers me; that is what I will have.' God helping me, it was that I took: *the righteousness of God without the law.* It was my *only* hope."

We may here notice, in passing, the precautions necessary in dealing with the material provided for the study of conversion by such narratives as those which have just been given.

There is, in the first place, an unavoidable tendency towards unconscious falsification on the part of the narrators. Experiences recorded later in life than the time of their occurrence will be conventionalized in accordance with the point of view of the narrator at the time they are recorded. Features not in harmony with the usual accounts of conversions in the convert's community will tend to be softened out. Childish experiences are often described in language which obviously belongs to a later age. Particularly must we suspect accounts which are obviously written for the sake of edification, since in these cases the process of conventionalization is certain to have crept in, however little the narrator may suspect it.

At the same time, we must notice an incompleteness in the narratives themselves. The data given are not all that the psychological student would require for a complete determination of the causes of all the phenomena recorded. If we accept the conclusions of modern psychology, the love interests of the person concerned are of vital importance in the determination of all the events of his mental life. Generally in the story of a conversion they are omitted or given in an incomplete form. It is rarely that we have a case like that of St. Augustine where the sexual history of the convert is given without reserve. An obvious case of incomplete data is found in the second of the narratives already given. Why was the subject so powerfully affected by the phrase " without the law "? The account gives no indication. It seems clear that it is connected with the getting rid of some moral conflict—with its evasion, or perhaps with the perception that it was unreal.

A third point of importance in this connection is the fact that, if the point of view of this essay be correct, then the most important determinants of conversion are not apparent to introspection, since they are unconscious. For example, the psychologist will not find it easy to accept Swearing Tom's statement that he was drawn to church merely by curiosity. He will rather be inclined to suspect that this conduct was the result of the already working

religious complex, but that it was rationalized in this way because, since the complex was repressed, this motive was unconscious.

Predominantly intellectual conversions present more difficulties than the type just considered. They seem always to be mixed up with moral elements, and it is difficult to tell how far the intellectual conflict is real, and how far it is a mere rationalization of a moral conflict. That a moral conflict may appear disguised as an intellectual one is no new discovery of modern psychology. Clergymen are quite familiar with the fact that the doubts of members of their congregations are often intimately connected with moral shortcomings in their lives.

St. Augustine may be taken as an example of a conversion of the intellectual type. Of his thirtieth year, he writes in his *Confessions*:

"But me for the most part the habit of satisfying an insatiable desire tormented while it held me captive. . . . So were we, until Thou, O most High, not forsaking our dust, commiserating us miserable, didst come to our help, by wondrous and secret ways.

"Continual efforts were made to have me married. I wooed, I was promised, chiefly through my mother's pains, that so once married, the health-giving baptism might cleanse me, towards which she rejoiced that I was being daily fitted. . . . Meanwhile my sins were being multiplied, and my concubine being torn from my side as a hindrance to my marriage, my heart which clave unto her was torn and wounded and bleeding. . . . But unhappy I, . . . impatient of delay, inasmuch as not till two years was I to obtain her I sought, not being so much a lover of marriage as a slave to lust, procured another, though no wife. . . . To Thee be praise, glory to Thee, Fountain of mercies. I was becoming more miserable, and Thou nearer."

In Book VII. he describes his intellectual difficulties. He thought of God as extended in space, though filling all things. He was unable to understand the cause of evil. He knew that free-will was supposed to be the cause of evil, but he did not find in this a solution of his difficulties. "For He should not be All-mighty, if He might not create something good without the aid of that matter which Himself had not created. These thoughts I revolved in my miserable heart, overcharged with gnawing cares, lest I should die ere I had found the truth; yet was the faith of Thy Christ, our Lord and Saviour, professed in the Church Catholic, firmly fixed in my heart, in many points, indeed, as yet unformed and fluctuating from the rule of doctrine; yet did not my mind utterly leave it, but rather daily took in more and more of it." By a study of Scripture, he came to have what he considered a right view of all these questions, and saw that iniquity was the perversion of the will. Though accepting Jesus Christ as the Mediator between God and man, he says that he

did not understand the true doctrine of the Incarnation, not understanding how that saying, "The Word was made flesh," distinguishes the Catholic faith from the heresy of Apollinarius, who taught that Christ had no human mind. These difficulties vanished away when he studied the writings of St. Paul.

He now accepted the orthodox faith. "But," he says, "for my temporal life, all was wavering, and *my heart had to be purged from the old leaven. The Way*, the Saviour Himself, well pleased me, but as yet I shrunk from going through its straitness." When told of the conversion of Victorinus, Rhetoric Professor at Rome, Augustine was on fire to imitate him, but found in himself two wills, the one spiritual, the other carnal. These struggled within him, until God delivered him out of the bonds of desire, wherewith he was bound most straitly to carnal concupiscence, and out of the drudgery of worldly things. He was afterwards much impressed by the story of St. Antony and of the conversion of two courtiers, told him by a Christian called Pontianus.

Then he seemed to see how foul he was, "how crooked and defiled, bespotted and ulcerous." "What ails us?" he exclaimed to his friend Alypius, with the emotion of his mental conflict showing in his face and manner, "What is it? What heardest thou? The unlearned start up and take heaven by force, and we with our learning, and without heart, lo, where we wallow in flesh and blood! Are we ashamed to follow, because others are gone before, and not ashamed not even to follow?"

The tumult of his inward contention hurried him to the garden of his lodging, where he would be free from any fear of interruption. He gives a graphic account of the conflict which took place here between his religious complex and the resistance opposing it. "Thus soul-sick was I, and tormented, accusing myself much more severely than was my wont, rolling and turning me in my chain, till that were wholly broken, whereby I now was but just, but still was, held. . . . The very toys of toys, and vanities of vanities, my ancient mistresses, still held me; they plucked my fleshly garment, and whispered softly, 'Dost thou cast us off?' . . . But now it spake very faintly. For on that side whither I had set my face, and whither I trembled to go, there appeared unto me the chaste dignity of Continence, serene, yet not relaxedly, gay, honestly alluring me to come, and doubt not; and stretching forth to receive and embrace me, her holy hands full of multitudes of good examples. . . . I sent up these sorrowful words: How long, how long, 'to-morrow and to-morrow'? Why not now? Why not this hour make an end to my uncleanness?"

While he was speaking and weeping in bitter contrition, he heard a child chanting, 'Take up and read; take up and read.

This he took as a command from God, and opening the book by chance, his eyes fell on the passage: ' Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying; but put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make not provision for the flesh ' in concupiscence. " No further would I read; nor needed I: for instantly at the end of this sentence, by a light as it were of serenity infused into my heart, all the darkness of doubt vanished away. . . . For Thou convertedst me unto Thyself, so that I sought neither wife, nor any hope in this world."

Of his state after his conversion, he says: " This Thy whole gift was, to nill what I willed, and to will what Thou willedst."

The intellectual power of St. Augustine, the introspective ability shown in his description of the conflict after it has become conscious, and the frankness with which he describes his sexual conflict, combine to make this an invaluable conversion record.

It also illustrates the difficulty, already mentioned, of distinguishing between the moral and intellectual parts of the conflict.

St. Augustine's intellectual difficulties about the nature of sin appear to have been intimately connected with his moral shortcomings. It is interesting to notice that his intellectual problems were solved first, and that it is the moral conflict alone which is active during the struggle in the garden. Yet we cannot dismiss the intellectual conflict as a mere rationalization of the intellectual one. St. Augustine's position as a teacher of philosophy makes it clear that his mind was of the intellectual type. It is important to recognize the important part shown by modern psychology to be played by purely emotional dispositions in determining belief and conduct. At the same time, the intellect does have a share, and this share will be larger in minds with an intellectual disposition and training.

It is difficult to find any case of a purely intellectual conversion in real life. In fiction, there is the conversion of Robert Elsmere in Mrs. Humphry Ward's novel, but this is probably defective psychology.

Conversions in which the main part of the conflict appears to be between opposing loyalties, which we will call " social conversions," will naturally be found most commonly in conversions from systems which make such demands upon the loyalty of their members that a breach with them involves a complete breach with its other members—a tearing apart of the bonds between the individual concerned and all the individuals with whom he has intimate personal relationships. Most religious bodies in the modern world do not make their demand upon the loyalties of their members in such an extreme form, so amongst these bodies we cannot expect to find many conversions of this type. It is found, however, in religious bodies where the community feeling is stronger, such as the Jews.

We have already quoted the example of St. Paul as a conversion of this type. Another example may be found in *The Varieties of Religious Experience*. As Professor James's work is so well known, this will not be repeated in full, but we will remind readers of the outlines of the case. It is that of a Jewish gentleman called M. Ratisbonne.

This gentleman was irreligious and had an antipathy to priests, although his brother was one. In Rome, in his twenty-ninth year, a French friend tried to make a proselyte of him, but succeeded not at all, except so far as to persuade him to hang (half jocosely) a religious medal round his neck, and to read a short prayer to the Virgin.

Left alone in a church, he passed quite unexpectedly through an experience which was indescribable. He saw a vision of the Virgin, and was found prostrate on the ground bathed in his tears. He asked for a priest, and made his confession. "You may ask me," he says, "how I came to this new insight, for truly I had never opened a book of religion nor ever even read a single page of the Bible, and the dogma of original sin is either entirely denied or forgotten by the Hebrews of to-day, so that I had thought so little about it that I doubt whether I ever knew its name. But how came I, then, to this perception of it? I can answer nothing save this, that on entering that church I was in darkness altogether, and on coming out of it I saw the fulness of the light. I can explain the change no better than by the simile of a profound sleep or the analogy of one who is born blind who should suddenly open his eyes to the day. He sees, but cannot define, the light which bathes him, and by means of which he sees the objects which excite his wonder."

There is a feature of special interest in this account. The conflict is completely unconscious until the moment of the instantaneous conversion. We know, however, from the work of Freud, that unconscious complexes have an outlet in dreams. Fortunately, the convert in this case has recorded a dream of the night before his conversion, when he saw a black cross with no Christ on it.

It is improbable that in any case of adult conversion, one only of the three types of conflict we have distinguished will be found. Always there is a combination of the moral, the intellectual, and the social conflict. There seems, however, to be sufficient empirical justification for distinguishing three main types of conversion, in each of which one of these conflicts is predominant.

This account of conversion is essentially the same as James's theory of "subconscious incubation." The difference is, however, important. Modern mental pathology has taught us a great deal more than was known in the days of James about the mechanism by which complexes are kept unconscious. Repression has been

studied in a great variety of cases, both where it has become pathogenic and where the subject has remained healthy. The theory of unconscious incubation is no longer a hypothesis introduced to explain the peculiarities of one particular phenomenon, the phenomenon of conversion. It is a process familiar in a number of different conditions, and of which the laws are very largely known. It has, therefore, gained both in definiteness and in credibility since it was put forward by Professor James in *The Varieties of Religious Experience.*

There are certain difficulties in the way of this account of conversion. In the first place, it must be admitted that the evidence is necessarily insufficient to demonstrate that this is the mechanism of all adult conversions. In certain cases, as that of St. Paul, the unconscious conflict gives signs of its existence by the effect of the resistance on conduct; but more often it can only be an inference from its sudden emergence into consciousness before the conversion.

The kind of evidence required for complete demonstration is a record of the dreams of the individual concerned for a period before his conversion. These would reveal any repressed complex which was occupying his unconscious mind during that time. They could only be analyzed after the conversion, since otherwise the complex would be made conscious and it would be necessary for the man to integrate it with the rest of his mental life, and its cataclysmic outbreak would be prevented. The difficulties of such an observation are obvious, and, so far as the present writer knows, it has never been carried out.

An objection to all psychological theories of conversion which comes frequently from religious persons demands sympathetic treatment, although we cannot admit its force. To them it appears that to attribute conversion to an action of the mind which can be paralleled in secular life is equivalent to denying the action of the Holy Spirit in conversion. There seems to be no reason for this fear. If we find that God works in accordance with law in the physical world, we may expect to find that the same will be true in the mental world. The only effect, from the point of view of the believer, of the theory suggested is that the interest in the conversion process is shifted from the actual moment of conversion to the period of growth of the underlying complex. In any case, it seems perilous to found an argument for the reality of divine action on our ignorance of the mechanism of conversion. That is bad philosophy, and it repeats in mental science an error of which theologians have already repented in biology.

Robert H. Thouless.

ANGLO-CATHOLICS AND EPISCOPAL AUTHORITY

[The writer desires to make it clear that although he was one of the members of the Continuation Committee of the Anglo-Catholic Congress who met certain of the Bishops at Cuddesdon in September last, yet this article represents only his own personal views on the question of the relation of Anglo-Catholics to episcopal authority. It must not be assumed that it represents the views of all the members of the Committee, or that it was accepted by the Bishops present at that Conference.]

It is one of the peculiar ironies of fate that the party within the Church of England which calls itself by the name of Anglo-Catholic should be generally regarded as a body whose main pleasure in life is to defy episcopal authority. For, whatever its attitude to the Bishops may have been in the past, and whatever the reasons for that attitude may have been, it is certain that its principles involve in themselves a far higher view of the nature of episcopal authority than is in general held by the members of the Church of England. Anglo-Catholics* are bound to regard the Bishop as, for the time being, the representative of the Apostles of our Lord within the limits of his diocese, and as enjoying the same authority as that given by our Lord in the first instance to the Twelve. They can neither see in him simply a representative of the believing Christians of the diocese, appointed to execute certain functions on their behalf, nor yet a national official appointed by the State for enforcing and propagating a certain view of the Christian religion which the State has found it convenient to adopt.

Yet, in fact, the progress of the Anglo-Catholic movement has in the past been made for the most part in the face of episcopal opposition and by ignoring episcopal authority. Consequently critics, not necessarily unfriendly, cannot help asking what the authority is which we are prepared to recognize. Clearly it is not simply the Papacy, for the condemnation of our Orders, though it may not be an infallible decision, is indisputably valid from a disciplinary point of view, if we admit the existing Papal system of authority at all. By ignoring it we are disobeying Roman authority just as much as an excommunicated priest of the Roman obedience, who continues exercising his ministry in the face of his excommunication. Yet we claim that our religion is essentially one of authority, so that we cannot simply be guided by our own private tastes.

On the other hand, it is clear that present Anglo-Catholic practice

* I shall use this term throughout to mean those persons who stand in general for the position outlined in the proceedings of the first Anglo-Catholic Congress. The term is open to certain objections, but it is not easy to find a better one.

does, in fact, go far beyond any possible Catholic interpretation of Elizabethan formularies. However much we claim that they can only be made into a consistent system of doctrine and liturgical practice by means of a Catholic interpretation of their many ambiguities, it is certain that they are at least in apparent contradiction to a vast amount of the present teaching and practice of the Anglo-Catholic movement. And these same elements of teaching and practice have been freely and repeatedly condemned by the Anglican Bishops, both individually and as a body. What, then, is the authority to which we appeal?

In the sphere of doctrine the answer is fairly simple. The Anglo-Catholic appeal has from the first been from the individual English Bishop or the local episcopate of the English provinces to the episcopate of the universal Church. The main source of Catholic authority, if we accept the view that the Church cannot be identified with the two great branches of it, each of which claims at present the exclusive right to the title of the Catholic Church, must always be in the first place to the formal and explicit teaching of the undivided Church as it existed prior to the final breach in A.D. 1054. This teaching need not be limited indeed to actual conciliar definitions, for in certain matters liturgical practice presupposes doctrinal beliefs; and where we find a doctrine implied in the universal liturgical practice of the undivided Church, that doctrine has an authority as great as if it had been explicitly formulated by the whole Church. There is, indeed, more room for varying explanations of the doctrine; but the truth of the doctrine itself must be retained in any explanation of it that may be given.

We are not, however, simply tied down by the beliefs of an era which closed almost a thousand years ago. Christian thought has been hampered in its certainty by the division of the Church, but it has not ceased. And in the development which it has undergone since the great schism, we may distinguish roughly between doctrinal definitions laid down by one of the two great branches of the divided Church and not contrary to the explicit or implicit teaching of the other branch on the one hand, and doctrines laid down by one branch but condemned by the other. There is obviously a wide distinction between the two classes. In the one case, although the definition as actually formulated by the one branch cannot claim absolute authority, yet the fact which it was intended to define has behind it a large consensus of Christendom; whereas in the second case we are dealing with one of those questions which are actually responsible for the division of Christendom, and we shall, if we are wise, refuse to regard the voice of one or other party to the quarrel as final. Thus, to take two obvious examples, we cannot claim to teach as of faith the dogmas of Transubstantiation or the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady, since they have never been explicitly

formulated by the undivided Church. But we can appeal to the *consensus* of Christendom before the Schism, and to the subsequent *consensus* of East and West, as revealed in teaching and in practice, in favour of our belief that the Blessed Sacrament is our Lord Himself (although we cannot define with certainty the manner of His presence) and our belief in the pre-eminent holiness of the Mother of God.

These, however, are questions which only a treatise on dogmatic theology can adequately discuss. The object of this article is to consider the relation of Anglo-Catholics to existing episcopal authority.

At the present time the difficulties that have arisen in regard to those relations arise rather in the sphere of discipline than in that of doctrine. The introduction of Catholic forms of devotion, whether in liturgical worship or in more popular services, and of the usual adjuncts of Catholic worship in matters of ritual or ceremonial that has been achieved during the past sixty years, has in the main been vigorously opposed by the Bishops, and the opposition is by no means extinct. In regard to most of these developments the Bishops have had the letter of Anglican formularies on their side, though in some, notably in the case of the ornaments rubric, they have weakened their case by endeavouring to enforce an interpretation of those formularies which is now generally admitted to be untenable. In most cases, however, it must be admitted that the Anglo-Catholics have, without episcopal sanction, introduced practices not covered by the letter of those formularies nor certainly by their spirit.

Now it might theoretically be urged that Anglo-Catholics ought to have been content to agitate by constitutional means for such a reformation of the English Liturgy and such toleration of other forms of devotion as they thought desirable, instead of acting on their own responsibility. The argument, however, ignores the fact that in the past the English Church has had no power to reform itself. It has no diocesan synods to enable the Bishops to obtain the advice and assistance of the clergy, and its provincial synods are elected on a grossly unrepresentative basis. Such an agitation could have had no prospect of success. Meanwhile, the formularies of Anglicanism were being interpreted by Bishops, whose authority was gravely impaired by the method of their appointment, while the growth during the century which preceded the Oxford Movement of an utterly uncatholic tradition had obscured even that minimum of Catholicism which those formularies had been intended to maintain. Meanwhile, souls were perishing, and the Sacraments were in danger of being forgotten. It is not surprising that Catholics acted without waiting for a reform of the Church of England, while it is in any case idle to ask whether their action was justified. For the Anglo-Catholic movement cannot now be forced to abandon what it has won, without a complete disruption of the English Church.

In all cases, however, the movement has appealed to authority.

The appeal may not always have been justified, and the conceptions of authority urged may have been in some cases untenable, but the appeal has always been there. And the authority claimed is essentially the same as that claimed in matters of doctrine. It is natural that this should be so, since liturgical and ceremonial practice and forms of popular devotion are only of value as means of bringing home the teaching of the Church to the popular mind. In the first place, there is the appeal to the practice of the undivided Church, and in the second, to those practices which have been introduced since the schism in one or other branch of the divided Church, and do not imply any doctrine which the other branch condemns. This class of devotional practices (the phrase being used to cover both liturgical and ceremonial forms and also popular devotions) cannot indeed be regarded as having the same authority as those of the undivided Church; but, except in so far as they are definitely repudiated by one of the two great branches, they can claim to be legitimate methods of bringing home to the minds of the faithful the teaching of the Church.*

Now it is precisely here that the real difficulty comes. For of the two great branches of the Church the Western alone has been seriously affected by the two historical facts which have had the greatest share in influencing the life and thought of modern Europe, the Reformation, and the industrial revolution. The result of these two facts has been to face the Church with the necessity of adapting herself to an intellectual outlook and a structure of society entirely different from that of the first millennium of our era. The Western Church has endeavoured to cope with the changed situation, and, in spite of the fact that she has failed in many ways to grasp the need of a wide revision of her doctrinal system, she has retained her hold on Europe probably to a far greater degree than any other Christian body. Now, since the civilization and the intellectual problems of England have much in common with those of the rest of Western Europe, it is natural that Anglo-Catholics should look to Western, that is, to Roman, methods for guidance as to the best methods of presenting the Catholic faith to the world.† In some cases, as for instance in the encouragement of frequent communion, they are merely reviving the forgotten ideals of the reformers in doing so; in others they are frankly reversing them, as in the encouragement of devotion to the reserved Sacrament and to the Saints. But in all cases alike they appeal from the proved failure

* It may indeed be argued that Anglicanism has a right to be heard. Theoretically this is true, and I firmly hold that it will make great contributions to Catholic thought, so soon as it has vindicated in practice its claim to be Catholic.

† This is not, of course, intended to criticize those Anglo-Catholics who prefer in liturgical matters a modified form of the use of Sarum, that use being in itself a local form of the Western use. There would be room in Anglo-Catholicism for both rites, the Roman and the Sarum.

of the English Church to meet the religious needs of the country during the century which preceded the Oxford Movement to practices of the Catholic Church, which have in fact proved a serious and successful attempt to adapt the Catholic faith to the needs of the age. It cannot of course be denied that there has been a good deal in the methods of individuals to call for criticism—a good deal of imitation of Roman practices because they are Roman, and a good deal of tactlessness in endeavouring to force such practices upon congregations which were not ready for them, and were expected to accept them on the *ipse dixit* of an individual priest. None the less, the appeal to Roman precedents is in itself reasonable, and has already been justified by its fruits.

Now it is precisely here that the need of assistance from episcopal authority is beginning to be felt. For while in the main the Roman Church has been remarkably successful in adapting itself to the needs of the time, it is by no means certain that all its methods are ultimately capable of strict theological justification, or that they may not tend to throw an exaggerated emphasis on certain particular truths of the Christian religion, and in so doing to obscure others no less important. For instance, it is fairly common to find devotions to Our Lady and the Saints tolerated, which are quite unjustifiable on any theological grounds. Yet at the present moment it is quite certain that any Anglican Bishop who endeavoured to interfere with the teaching of such devotions would either be ignored by a parish priest who desired to teach his congregation to practise them, or else reluctantly obeyed for fear of persecution. The reason would be that the Bishop's action would inevitably be attributed to a purely Protestant objection to the Catholic doctrine of the communion of Saints; and in the face of the history of the past ninety years the assumption would hardly be an unnatural one. Yet, in fact, the Bishop might very well be right in regarding the particular devotion as undesirable. It is here that authority of the Bishop is needed, as one who is able both to judge the needs of the Church over a wider area than falls within the range of vision of a particular parish priest, and also to have recourse to the opinion of expert theologians more readily than the parish priest is ordinarily able to do. But in the present position it is idle to suppose that Anglo-Catholics will pay the smallest heed to episcopal authority unless they are convinced that the Bishops are really prepared to accept the appeal from a somewhat Protestant interpretation of Anglican formularies to the experience of Catholicism, as being at least a legitimate one, and to judge of their practices in the light of the teaching of the universal Church and the experience of those who have been most successful in bringing home that teaching to the hearts and minds of men living in the surroundings of the present day. If that appeal were really to be accepted by the

Bishops, it is safe to say that Anglo-Catholics would recognize their authority to the full; otherwise it is to be feared that the present chaos will continue, and the occasional appeals on the part of English diocesans to their authority as Catholic Bishops will be in danger of falling on deaf ears.

It is at the same time important to bear in mind that Anglo-Catholics do not, of course, desire that their principles should be enforced on those who do not recognize them. Ultimately, indeed, they hope to see them prevail throughout the whole Anglican communion, for they believe that there is room within the limits of Catholicism for all that is of positive and permanent value in the religious experience of those who at present reject a great deal of the Catholic system. (It need hardly be added that they recognize to the full the extraordinary value of the religious experience of many persons and many religious bodies of this type; but they hold that they would find in the Catholic religion nothing to hamper their religious life and much to aid it.) But they only ask that at the present moment their position should be recognized as legitimate, and that they should be relieved from the reproach of disloyalty to the English Church, when, in fact, they are doing all that lies in their power to save her. They cannot indeed agree to any lessening of that minimum standard of Catholicism which is maintained by the formularies of Anglicanism, and which is, apart from one or two unfortunate details, safeguarded by the Report of the Lambeth Conference, since such a lessening would involve the forfeiture of the claim of the Church of England to be a true part of the Catholic Church. But they have no desire to exclude others, or to refuse to co-operate with them in reclaiming England for the Kingdom of God.

Into many important points of detail there is no space to enter. It is obvious that the establishment of really satisfactory relations between Anglo-Catholics and the episcopate demands a division of dioceses and the institution of diocesan synods in order that the Bishop may be able both to advise and to consult his clergy effectively, a reform of Convocation which will make it really representative, and the revision of the existing system of appointing Bishops. (Naturally it is not to be supposed that Anglo-Catholics deny that it has often produced good appointments, but a bad system cannot be justified by the fact that it does not always work badly.) But without such a recognition of the legitimacy of the claims of Anglo-Catholicism as has been indicated, and a frank abandonment of the policy of the repression of Catholics or their exclusion from posts of influence, no reform of machinery will bring peace; while, on the other hand, a change of spirit will do much to atone for the defects of the existing machinery. *O pray for the peace of Jerusalem: they shall prosper that love thee.*

WILFRED L. KNOX.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

The article in this number by the Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford furnishes an answer to a question which many are asking—viz., how far and on what principle the Old Testament still has value for the Catholic Church of to-day. We believe that Canon Cooke's insistence on what we may call a Christocentric attitude to the Old Testament provides the essential basis for its study and use, both public and private, and will command the very general assent of our readers.

We publish this month the first of two articles showing how the new psychology may be applied to concrete types of religious experience. Mr. Thouless holds the Burney Studentship in the Philosophy of Religion at Cambridge, and is Caldwell Research Student at Corpus Christi College. Mr. Thouless's second article will appear early next year.

We have received a letter from the Rev. P. L. Snowden with regard to the review of his book on the Atonement by Mr. Mozley contained in an article in our October number. While thanking the writer of that article for his appreciative comment, Mr. Snowden asks to be allowed to disclaim any views which, from Mr. Mozley's review, might be attributed to him to the effect: (1) That separation is possible between the holiness and love of God; (2) that the Christian is both Redeemer and redeemed; (3) that our Lord's sacrifice for sin is not complete as a full, perfect, and sufficient satisfaction for the sins of the whole world.

It has been decided to bind the first half-year's numbers of THEOLOGY, and the cases may be had from The Secretary, S.P.C.K., 6, St. Martin's Place, W.C. 2, price 1s. 6d. An index is provided with the present number.

Nothing better than Father Kelly's *Principles of Reunion* (S.P.C.K., 8d.) has appeared on this subject. It presents a whole theology in most readable form; and the author has the rare gift of knowing how to commend his case to those who differ from him as yet. He is one of those writers who make us feel quite sure that truth will eventually prevail.

It is a far cry from Mr. Hugh Walpole's *Jeremy* to *The Captives* (John Murray, 7s. 6d.), which is his latest novel. The latter is less agreeable, but gives perhaps more food for thought. The story turns on the attempts of the heroine—if such Maggie Cardinal can be called—to emancipate herself from "the inherited consciousness of God." This *damnosa hæreditas* is centred first in her father, a clergyman, and later in the inner group of votaries at a chapel in Covent Garden. The portrait of the Old Man who is the presiding genius of the group is powerfully drawn. We cannot be surprised that Maggie revolts against this religious atmosphere, nor indeed that her revolt leads her into a life devoid of morality; but we hope that Mr. Walpole may discover other kinds of religious consciousness whose inheritance—and we understand that some psychologists would not deny

such heredity—would not be so disastrous as this. The book is indeed a proof how important it is to scrutinize the ultimate sources from which any religion is inherited.

"IN THE SPIRIT"

Dominus Illuminatio.

"O ye that love the Lord, see that ye hate the thing which is evil."—PSALM xcvii. 10.

SOME of the saints have been remarkable for their zeal in resisting and opposing sin. They were first of all severe towards themselves in respect of the motions of sins which they perceived, while outwardly they were ceaselessly at war with the sins of their own time. Examination of their lives reveals in them both the inspiration and power of a great love for God. They hated evil, because so intensely they loved the good. Their example suggests a test of spiritual reality which ordinary Christians might apply with profit to themselves. Long ago the Psalmist said, "O ye that love the Lord, see that ye hate the thing which is evil." The more perfect and pure our love for God, the more direct and uncompromising should be our attitude towards sin. And the saint knows that any weakness in the presence of sin, or hesitation when tempted to evil, is followed immediately by dulness of spirit and feebleness in devotion, because every inclination towards sin is in its degree a turning from God. "If I incline unto wickedness in my heart, the Lord will not hear me." God not only is displeased, but also makes us feel His displeasure. May not this be the fact underlying our experience of failure in devotion and of weakness in effort? Is it not a warning to us that our love is not pure? We cannot at the same time love God and cherish the evil. Direct action is called for in the inner life. Love that is so strong and clear that it is hostile to sin, whether secret or open, must be the result of sustained intention and steadfast willing in the interior life. There, where the soul acts with hidden heroism, must the love grow through spiritual victories over sin; through secret mortifications of natural dispositions; and through obedience to the Spirit of God. So loving Him we shall hate the evil.

X.

Oremus.

Prayers in Times of Industrial Unrest.

Almighty God, Who through Thy Son Jesus Christ hast given us commandment to do unto others as we would they should do unto us, grant that every member of our Church and Nation may so learn and practise this obedience, that in new fellowship and brotherly love we may find new happiness and peace, and as one family offer unto Thee the manifold fruits of our service; through the same Jesus Christ our Lord.

Source: Original.

O God, the King of Righteousness, lead us, we pray Thee, in the ways of justice and of peace; inspire us to break down all tyranny and oppression, to gain for every man his due reward, and from every man his due service, that each may live for all, and all may care for each, in the Name of Jesus Christ our Lord.

Source: From the *Call to Prayer* of the Life and Liberty Movement (S.P.C.K.).

Almighty God, Who Thyself art Love, fill us with the spirit of Thy holy love; that our hearts being kindled thereby, we may for ever and ever love Thee, and each other in Thee, and all men for Thee; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Source: Adapted from a prayer in Canon Bullock Webster's *Churchman's Manual of Prayer* (*cf.* the Mozarabic Collect for Sexagesima).

The Word in Action.

Heroism. III.—In the Home.

"Yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also."—St. Luke ii. 35.

Not our thoughts, but the thoughts of our hearers, is what we have to explain to ourselves and to them. Not in *our* language, but in theirs, must we speak if we mean to make ourselves understood by them. By talking with the humblest of the poor in the parishes where our lot as pastors is cast we shall gain the best materials—materials how rich and how varied and how just!—for our future sermons. By addressing ourselves not to any imaginary congregation or to any abstract and distant circumstances, but to the actual needs which we know, in the hearts of our neighbours and ourselves, we shall rouse the sleeper, and startle the sluggard, and convince the unbelievers, and enlighten the unlearned.—Dean Stanley.

As in modern warfare the loyalty and heroism of officers are equalled only by similar qualities in the rank and file or lower deck, so in the mission-field the activity of Bishops would be lost labour without the perseverance of their Priests and Teachers. There remain the innumerable homes, where the loyalty of the wife finds its complement in the heroism of the mother. They are homes, thank God! of every station and varying circumstance. So the nature which the only-begotten Son of God took upon Him was of an ancient nobility, albeit in royal David's city He was born as at this time in every condition of discomfort; the glory of Israel was hid for a season in a carpenter's shop in Galilee of the Gentiles. And when the Chosen People let heathen soldiery loose upon the sacred person of their common Saviour, they, incidentally as it were, broke His human mother's heart, as Simeon had foretold. To Pilate in the Prætorium Jesus was but one more Galilean stirring up the multitudes; to the by-standers on Calvary Mary was but one more Rachel, weeping for her children.

It would be easy to digress upon the suffering of women, especially mothers of families, in all international or industrial warfare: it is a terrible and age-long complication of most political and economic problems. But the heroism of the home is exhibited by the man as well. It is the Spirit of Christ by the fireside. It appears in the Christmas picture as St. Joseph's figure, grave, scrupulous, untiring, in the background.

It sometimes seems to Y, in his heretical moments, a pity that the Ascension should have made The Risen Body for awhile unseen. The prospect of the Son of Man, reappearing some day "in the clouds" with the holy angels, seems to him less compelling than the thought of Christ might be, caught away by the Spirit perhaps after those forty days, but itinerant now among His other sheep, a veritable wandering Jew with blessing for a curse, vanishing as soon as known on the Emmaus road, tending the harvest of the world.

"Behold, I stand at the door and knock!" The mother of six, making do on twenty shillings (pre-war) a week, would open dubiously in the

evening light. Or the drowsy father, risen an hour early to clothe and feed the motherless children before he goes to work, would find the door already open—nay, shut—and a waiting Presence on the dim hearth. The jaded prostitute, plying her trade for a crippled parent's sake, would hear a sudden voice, " No, not that way ! Come, hear about another Mary." . . .

For the heroism of the home none had a surer eye than Charles Dickens, but he does not seem to have suspected or noticed it in any but the meanest families. The reader may almost infer from the *Christmas Carol* that in his eyes the middle classes of nineteenth-century England would have received equal condemnation with the upper class of eighteenth-century France. And, by the way, what better example of loyalty than Sydney Carton ?

This condemnation persists, noisy and indiscriminate, to-day. Small reasoning is made of the country rectories or stately homes of England, still less of the friendly portals of a Puritan " capitalist " here and there, whence issued so many victims for the sacrifice of war, characters moulded by the delicate persistence of older Christian souls, with long anxiety and intense hope. It is part of the punishment of just for unjust, that phrases like " the idle rich " and " the leisured classes " should have become so popular. Thus in its issue of October 12, 1920, after sneering (in another column) at the Prince of Wales himself, the *Daily Herald*, in a special account of his home-coming, comments upon the predominance of lady spectators " who, having maids at home to do the housework, were able to give up the morning to the thrills of royal sight-seeing." It is of course common knowledge that a growing proportion of " the leisured classes " in England, since the war (as in Canada, for instance, before it), do their own house-work, and that the neglect of house-work on the part of some of the other classes in town and country is the despair of those who would fain give the heroism of the home its due.

But when so much has been said, it remains a duty to honour (say) the miner's wife who prepares a succession of meals for breadwinners setting out and returning at all hours according to shift, makes herself responsible for shopping, mending, washing, and perhaps poultry between whiles, and is probably nursing an invalid upstairs or next door into the bargain. There may be anything up to £20 coming into that house weekly; but it does not all reach madame, and if it did she would willingly let some of it go, I daresay, for a little rest. All this, mind you, without the consolations of public worship: she simply hasn't time.

Then there are the many, of both sexes, who decline or defer marriage lest they ruffle the declining years of some old relative. Many, but not all. And if the others have excellent reasons for acting or neglecting as they do, well, at least the many are heroes and heroines every one.

Last, but not least, come the parents who stint and starve themselves through long years, which may after all be ended by the sword of disappointment, that their children may be equipped according to their station in life. Are they to be written in the Book of Snobs because they disdain free education and live in rateable houses ? No, but their children are—if they forget. For every " infant phenomenon " whose future (according to a later autobiography) was imperilled by unsympathetic parents there must be dozens of great men whose greatness rests principally upon the foundation of a disciplined childhood.

Loyalty to one another ? Ay, for richer, for poorer, for better, for worse.

Loyalty to the King ? Let us use those State prayers, for the royal home as for the royal happiness, and give thanks for its example.

Loyalty to God ? Behold the handmaid of the Lord.

Y

REVIEWS

A Short History of the Italian People: from the Barbarian Invasions to the Attainment of Unity. By Janet Penrose Trevelyan. London and New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1920. Demy 8vo. Pp. xiv, 580. 25s. net.

Mrs. Trevelyan's handsome volume, furnished with 24 interesting illustrations, 6 excellent maps, a very full bibliography of well over 300 separate entries, and an adequate index, makes the best concise history of the Italian nation which we have had of late years. Its author is modest about her intentions and achievement—as far back as 1902, when she was giving a series of lantern lectures on Italian history to London school-children, at the Passmore Edwards Settlement, the pressing need of some such work as this was borne in upon her: this is the highly satisfactory result. Mrs. Trevelyan speaks of it as a summary and an introduction, and disclaims any attempt at original research, or study at first hand in Italian archives, or new discoveries in Italian history. But she knows Italy and the Italians well, and has read all the best Italian, French, German, and British authorities; she has had the help and criticism of folk learned in her subject, and she may well congratulate herself on having accomplished what she set out to do —namely, to encourage attention to a branch of history which has been neglected both in English and American education. "The history of Italy," she observes rightly, "should take its place in all our higher schools, no less than that of France, Greece, and ancient Rome, for in the brilliance of its incidents, the richness and variety of the human types that it presents, it is surely unsurpassed in all the European scene." In her thirty chapters Mrs. Trevelyan gives us a clear and illuminating view of the fortunes of the Italian people, from the Barbarian invasions of the fourth and fifth centuries to the completion of Italian unity in 1870. An astonishing variety of subjects is dealt with in her story: the Kingdom of Theodoric; the Lombards, the Popes, and the Franks; the Normans in Southern Italy; the Rise of the Cities; Rome and the Papacy during the Fourteenth Century; the Pontificate of Julius II.; the Sack of Rome; the Glory and Decline of Venice; the Seventeenth-Century Popes; the Evolution of Savoy; the Napoleonic Era; finally, the Making of Italy in Recent Times. Plan and execution alike are admirable, and if the work is perhaps somewhat beyond the powers of even high-school children, it is certainly one which should appeal to that much-pampered person, the general reader.

To Churchmen, the main interest of Mrs. Trevelyan's book will lie in its author's account of the relations between the Church and

the political history of Italy. The recent disturbances in Europe have once more brought that subject to the front, more perhaps in the way of reflection than in the sphere of practical politics. It is now fifty years since Italy entered Rome, and the third Italy of history embarked on a voyage which was, to say the least, of doubtful success and of highly possible peril. During those fifty years she grew greatly in strength, only to encounter, in 1914, the most serious danger that had threatened her since the days of Victor Emmanuel and Cavour. It was not until November, 1918, that she and her sympathizers were able to see that danger averted. Had the German and Austrian armies emerged triumphant from the war which ended in their complete defeat and the overthrow of the Central European Empires, there is no doubt that the temporal power of the Papacy would have been once more set up, probably in a more autocratic form than before, and Italy would again have been parcelled out, and the work of the *risorgimento* undone. Fortunately, the war ended as we know, and Italy, though sore shaken and greatly troubled in social and economic relationships, is still a nation, more solidified and united than ever. No one knows this better than the politicians of the Vatican, who, after all their intriguing and wire-pulling with German and Austrian diplomats, have seen the complete disappearance of Austria from the weighty influences of Europe, and the ex-Kaiser reduced to a nonentity. To the Vatican the pregnant message of the war must surely have been that medievalism is at last crushed for ever, that no Pope will ever again have the chance of misusing temporal power, and that the Catholics of Italy must henceforth be allowed, without ecclesiastical let or hindrance, to take their rightful places as parts and parcels of Italy, a nation.

Mrs. Trevelyan is one of those writers who make manifest an almost meticulous desire to be fair, unbiased, and scrupulously just, and though her sympathies are wholly with the Italian spirit which fought its way to freedom in the period 1860-70, she lets down the opposing forces of obscurantism and reaction very easily—far more easily, indeed, than they merit. Yet whoever reads her book carefully, supplying from other sources certain matters at which its author only hints, cannot fail to perceive that the arch-enemy of Italy in her long struggle for freedom—political, intellectual, social, economic—is, and always has been, Clericalism. Century after century the story is always the same, always repeating itself. Whatever there may have been of religion, there was always far more of politics, and politics of the worst sort—intrigue, conspiracy, wire-pulling. It is difficult to get at the minds and intentions of the medieval Popes and their aiders and abettors, but not difficult to perceive that they regarded the faithful as so many sheep to be well shorn, and that they were never slow to invoke the aid of foreign

mercenaries if the flock at any time manifested a disinclination to part with its last shred of wool. Always, from its beginnings, that slice of Italy which came to be known as the Papal States was behind the times in civilization—not even Naples, in its worst days, was as far back in the line of advancement as those regions whereof the Popes were kings. And all through the time of that species of rule —a monarchy which, considering the spiritual claim so unblushingly claimed for it, should have been an example to all other Governments—it is always a question of money. Christianity—of a sort—may have been taught, nominally, but what the folk really knew of the Papacy, and always had evident before their eyes, was oppressive collection of dues—so-called. "The Papal methods of taxation," remarks Mrs. Trevelyan, "contributed most powerfully to the degradation of the people, by driving the peasants from their homes to swell the ranks of the banditti; hearth-taxes, often levied three times in the year; salt-taxes always on the increase; taxes on all forms of produce entering Rome ground down the peasants of the Patrimony to the level of wild beasts." This is an excellent gloss on the command to Simon Peter to feed his Master's sheep.

Extraordinary as it seems to students of history, there are to-day many and influential supporters of the theory—which they earnestly desire to see reduced to practice—of the temporal power of the Papacy; people who, in order to set the Pope on the throne from which he was cast down in 1870, would cheerfully see Italy once more split up into small, disunited divisions. Have such people ever made a careful study of the social and economic conditions of the Papal States during the Pontificate of Pius IX.? Although we were then in the middle of the nineteenth century, although progress of all sorts was spreading all over the world, the territory over which Pius held sway was, without question, the black patch of Europe. Mr. Gladstone, making a visit of inquiry in the kingdom of Naples in 1850, and revealing the story of the iniquities which he found there (over four thousand political offenders were rotting in the Neapolitan prisons) in his indignant *Letters to Lord Aberdeen*, might well have extended his inquest to the Papal States, for matters were far worse there under Pius than they ever were in Naples under the infamous Bomba. While Pius, determined to have nothing more to do with Liberalism and constitutional government, occupied himself in the study of the Immaculate Conception, the people of his territory were more outrageously oppressed, more heavily taxed, than at any period since the days of the Borgias. But the matter has been well and truly summed up by Cesare: "The Pontifical Government exercised a double tyranny, both political and religious; it availed itself of every device, and supported its favourites by underhand means and female influence; it ruled without justice, and

meddled in every relation of public and private life . . .; from the day of its resurrection [1850] until the day of its death [1870] it lived in fear and trepidation." But during those twenty years, Antonelli, the man behind Pius, flourished—Antonelli, who, as Mrs. Trevelyan aptly reminds us, "had all the instincts of a brigand combined with the talents of a Wall Street manipulator, and used his position to devise so colossal a system of graft that he died with a fortune variously estimated at 25 to 60 million lire. He had himself and his family ennobled, and placed one of his brothers at the *Annona*, or corn distribution of Rome, and another at the head of the *Banca Romana*, so that between them the two could control the rise and fall of prices and make vast sums from the distresses of the poor." Little wonder that in those last days of Papal power the popular, sarcastic cry in the streets of the Eternal City was *Holy Father and Dear Bread!*

But Pius IX. was not occupied with thoughts of the people's bread, dear or cheap. After his youthful flirtations with Liberalism, and his experiences of fugitive life at Gaeta, he betook himself first to a study of the Immaculate Conception, then to a promulgation of the Syllabus, and finally to the forcing of the dogma of Infallibility down the throats of the assembled hierarchy. If there is one defect in Mrs. Trevelyan's book—a defect which she might well remedy in a subsequent edition—it is that she has said comparatively little of the doings and effects of the Vatican Council of 1870, and of the final extinction of the temporal power. It is only now, after fifty years, that the Christian world is beginning to learn the true purport and meaning of the decree which Pius IX. skilfully engineered to his desired end; now—especially after the doings of the Papacy in relation to the recent war—we know that Mr. Gladstone's conclusion was a far-sighted one: "For the first time in my life, I shall now be obliged to talk about Papacy; for it would be a scandal to call the religion they are manufacturing at Rome by the same name as that of Pascal, or of Bossuet, or of Ganganelli. The truth is that Ultramontanism is an anti-social power." This is precisely why Mrs. Trevelyan should have devoted more attention to the Vatican Council, and to the loss of the temporal power, for when the temporal power went, the Infallibility decree was set up, and Infallibility means Ultramontanism, and Ultramontanism means Clericalism, and Clericalism is the arch-enemy which Italy, a nation, has most to fear. And none of us who have reason to love and admire her wish to see Italy fearing anything, least of all anything within herself. Italy, with a great yesterday, has a still greater to-morrow; it is as a recent essayist has well said: "The Italian race, prolific, industrious, and skilled, both in agriculture and industry, has a greater future before it in Europe and in America than some people realize." To

ensure that future the one thing needful is that nothing should break or disturb the unity which has now existed and grown stronger during fifty eventful years.

J. S. Fletcher.

The Resurrection of Christ: an Examination of the Apostolic Belief and its Significance for the Christian Faith. By the Rev. John Mackintosh Shaw, M.A. (Edin.), Professor of Apologetics and Systematic Theology in the Presbyterian College, Halifax, Nova Scotia. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1920. Pp. viii, 215. 9s.

This work is the publication in book form, with certain additions and amplifications, of Professor Shaw's long, elaborate article on "the Resurrection of Christ" in the second volume of Dr. Hastings' *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*. The publishers are to be congratulated on their enterprise in acceding to requests, which reached them from many quarters, for its re-issue in this form. Within the limits which the author has assigned to himself, there could hardly be any more careful, scholarly, lucid, and reverent treatment of this great subject. The material is admirably arranged, and the evidence marshalled with accuracy and fairness. The writer himself is a whole-hearted supporter of the orthodox belief, and the apologetic tone is possibly too much in evidence throughout the book; but other views and hypotheses are patiently examined, and there is a full survey, with excellent bibliographies at the end of each chapter, of all the literature upon the subject. Indeed, the book is more than a work upon the Resurrection: it is to some extent a survey of New Testament theology, with special reference to the Person and Work of our Lord.

We have only noticed two slight errors in the text: a comma is misplaced in the first line of p. 141, and some italics are missing on p. 182, l. 23.

And yet, having said so much, we hope, partly for the very reason that Professor Shaw has done his work so well, that his volume will be the last of its kind for some long time to come. There is no doubt plenty of room for it, largely owing to the appearance in late years of several unsatisfactory or at least one-sided works upon the Resurrection, but a student of this book will, we think, rise from its perusal with the feeling that, though it may have taught him a considerable amount, it has not greatly strengthened his belief in Christ. The point of view taken throughout is summed up in a quotation from Bishop Westcott, which closes the book: "There is no single historic incident better or more variously supported than the Resurrection of Christ." This is doubtless true, and yet nothing is becoming clearer than that belief in the

Resurrection, if it is to be real belief, must rest on something more than historical evidence, and that attempts to treat a religious truth simply as an historical fact, however apparently successful and convincing, have by themselves no religious value. Professor Shaw himself repeatedly admits that belief in our Lord's Resurrection is spiritually conditioned—see, *e.g.*, pp. 10, 75 f., 180, 190—and perhaps nothing could be better than his remarks upon this point, but they do not seem to be fully worked out in relation to the main tendency of the book, which lays almost the whole stress on the historical. It is disappointing that at the one place in the book (p. 100) where he approaches the problem of the relation of matter and spirit, he abruptly closes the discussion with a quotation from Dr. Armitage Robinson. We could wish that he had allowed himself to treat of the Resurrection in closer connection with the Crucifixion, and with the whole problem of the Person of Christ. So far as we have observed, he never treats the Resurrection except as a fact in the temporal order (there is, we believe, only one passing reference in the book to our Lord's words in St. John xi. 25: "I am the Resurrection"), and he insists frequently that the Resurrection formed a new beginning in the life of Christ Himself. For this view he can claim with justice ample support from the New Testament, not only from the words of our Lord Himself, but particularly from the speeches of St. Peter in Acts, and the earlier Epistles of St. Paul; but it is, after all, only one side of the truth, and, though the first which commends itself to us, yet in reality not the first or most important side. For, from St. John's point of view, our Lord did not *become* at the Resurrection or even the Ascension anything that He was not before, or had not been at every stage of His career on earth. One great purpose of the Fourth Gospel is to emphasize and give its due weight to this eternal, timeless side of the Person of Christ. In that gospel our Lord gives life throughout His ministry, simply because of what He *is*, and not only because of what He will effect. He speaks throughout as though He were already in heaven, and it is not an accident that in St. John xvii. 3 He regards His work as already accomplished, although the Cross still lay before Him. (We may compare with this the thanksgiving at the grave of Lazarus in St. John xi. 41, uttered *before* the word and act of power itself.) In the Person of Christ, the Incarnation, Crucifixion, Resurrection, Ascension, and Pentecost are not separated, isolated facts; they must be treated ultimately as a single whole; and we cannot help regretting that Professor Shaw has not seen his way to handle this deeper aspect of his theme more fully, especially as it is likely to become of increasing interest and importance; but we repeat that as a reverent and careful summary of critical study of the Resurrection his book is wholly admirable.

R. H. Lightfoot.

LAMBETH CONFERENCE REVIEWS

V.—THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN

At last! These words express better than any others the general impression of the resolutions passed by the Lambeth Conference on the position of women in the councils and ministrations of the Church. No one can feel very proud of the attitude of the Reformed Church to women, for the last 400 years offer little or nothing as a contribution towards St. Paul's ideal. Impatient ones knocked vainly at closed doors; brilliant women, in the seventeenth century, like Mary Astell, tried to secure some opportunity for education, but a Bishop blocked the way, tossing aside her project of a college as "a Protestant nunnery." In later times Florence Nightingale made her celebrated indictment in her letter to Dean Stanley, writing that the "Church of England has for men bishoprics, archbishoprics, and a little work (good men make a great deal for themselves); for women she has—what? I had no taste for theological discoveries. I would have given her my heart, my hand, my head. She would not have them. She did not know what to do with them. She told me to go back to my crochet in my mother's drawing-room; or, if I were tired of that, to marry and look well at the head of my husband's table. 'You may go to the Sunday School if you like,' she said. But she gave me neither work to do nor education for it."

Yet still the power of God was offering instance after instance of His willingness to use women for work that the world might have well counted as unsuitable. Elizabeth Fry was to carry forward Howard's work with a force of personality and determination that practically secured the reformation of the prisons. Hannah More was in the forefront of education. Florence Nightingale was to reorganize the whole of the R.A.M.C., and to work at the sanitation of the Indian Army. Josephine Butler was called to make her solitary stand against organized vice; Sister Dora had to tackle the conditions in workhouse infirmaries; Octavia Hill became the acknowledged authority and the pioneer of housing. These were Victorian women for the most part born and bred in convention, and, so far as Church authority was concerned, still bound by convention. Ecclesiastical authority may have retained the power to bind; it had absolutely lost the power to liberate.

The religious orders returned almost secretly and without a word of welcome. They are even now dismissed in the Lambeth Committee Report with a scant reference and a quotation from Scripture. They were outside the terms of reference. Our religious communities, which have proved themselves to be the most attractive

of all religious vocations open to women, have practically always been outside the terms of reference. Bishops still refuse to profess Sisters. But Lambeth has at least desired and hoped that God, who has begun a good work, will perfect it, so that perhaps no one will any longer wish to hinder the beginning.

But, after all, in a time of opportunity we must not dwell on the past, and the way has been made very much clearer. The resolutions of the Conference are almost entirely concerned with deaconesses. The diaconissate has been more or less patronized by authority since its attempted restoration, but patronage is apt to be irresponsible, and though deaconesses were " set apart," no one was prepared to determine what was meant and what conferred by the laying on of hands. Some Bishops refused to have anything to do with the diaconissate, so that it was forced into a diocesan organization, and was not of the whole Church. The word " deaconess " became a term (vaguely used, as it still is) for any church worker, and no one protested. The reproach is now removed. The resolution that places the form and manner of making a deaconess in the Prayer Book has raised a tentative experiment from the state of uncertainty into a definite and acknowledged place in Church order. There should no longer be the hesitating hope that these women will not do much harm, but a real and ardent expectation that the power of the Holy Spirit will be poured out through new channels.

Like all Englishmen in every walk in life, our Church, clergy and laity alike, is far too apt to ask no more than to be let alone and not disturbed, but this attitude saps our spiritual vigour, that should be expecting and hoping all things. Let us, then, look forward to the real diaconissate with hope.

The privileges allotted to deaconesses are not startling, but they are granted permission to read the choir offices in church, and to preach under regulation. For the rest the work instanced has already been done by women in many if not most parishes.

The resolutions clearly state that the diaconissate is the only apostolic ministry open to women, and deaconesses are allowed no place in the administration of the Holy Communion. The Committee recommended that the deaconess might render assistance at the administration of the Holy Communion to sick persons, but it was not incorporated in the resolutions. There is some historic evidence that this was allowed in the Primitive Church, but it does not seem conclusive.

In any case, it is important that no change should be made in the ministry of the sacraments, for that which is essential could not be given by hands not generally acceptable. Hitherto the deaconess has been " set apart," but the Lambeth Conference retracts somewhat from the apartness. The resolutions affirm the lifelong

character of the order, but they impose no vow of celibacy. Indeed, the Committee seemed unable to get away from the idea of marriage, and it occurs again and again with a somewhat characteristically nervous view of woman's vocation. We might point out that there are probably over two million too many women in our country, but nothing must distract our minds from the thought of marriage. It is almost inferred that the ascetic ideals of the Church were responsible for the decreasing birth-rate, but it would be a bold man who could accuse the English Church of asceticism. But there is no word to commend the gallant and scriptural adventure of celibacy for the sake of the kingdom of heaven. A wise and learned priest of the Church said not long since that the strength of Rome lay in its bold claim of "all or nothing." We still hesitate a bit over leaving all. But this freedom is frankly welcomed by many, and the idea of the priest's wife as a deaconess is congenial. Others believe that Mr. and Mrs. Clergyman might prove themselves to be a little over-professional. The more dangerous point seems to be that it leaves the deaconess vulnerable as regards gossip.

A seemingly belated resolution grants the admission of women to all church councils open to laymen. But we have to remember that England is not the whole of the Anglican Communion, and this will represent a real charter to women in other parts of the Church. Duly qualified women are permitted to speak when approved by the Bishop in consecrated buildings. We have direct evidence that when a pilgrim in the Pilgrimages of Prayer was allowed to speak in church, she was able to have and to leave a direct influence in regard to churchgoing. This privilege rightly used should be of great spiritual value, but it would be a real abuse if any lay person were invited to speak without due preparation and qualification. The nave should be, after all, a useful, friendly place where meetings of many sorts might be held. The missionary meeting is badly housed in a village schoolroom, but finds its true home in the church.

Members of the Mothers' Union ought to be able to meet to pray and speak together in their spiritual home. A priest reading the Mothers' Union Prayer gets considerably entangled in the personal pronouns.

A short resolution commends the case of the salaried church-worker to the branches of the Anglican Communion which employ her. It is to be hoped that every diocese will take this to heart, the "missionary" dioceses not excepted.

The Committee say in their Report that they are conscious that there is a danger lest Churchmen should shirk their responsibilities, and leave too heavy a share in the counsels of the Church to Church-women. It is important that the parable of the talents be laid to heart. If any individual, or group, or nation, or race, or sex,

does not trade with its talents, they are taken away. But no one would cripple those who seek to use their gifts in order to save the face of those who refuse. But this has proved no difficulty in the State; why, then, should the Church fear? Are we not one Body?

But the whole summing-up must be of thankfulness. Some part of the long-standing reproach has at length been removed from our Church. We may regret that the Family of Christ was unable to lead the world, but followed only when the world had first acted. But perhaps *God* provokes His people to righteousness thus, and we have no reason to complain if only His righteousness is attained.

ELMA K. PAGET.

VI.—WOMEN AND THE APOSTOLIC COMMISSION.

THE Bishops at the Lambeth Conference have strongly upheld the rights of women in the councils and ministrations of the Church, and it becomes a question whether, in their anxiety to do justice, or something more than justice, to feminine aspirations, they have not gone wrong in their interpretation of certain passages in the Gospels and Epistles, which they hold to be pertinent to the matter in hand. "In our judgment," they say, "there is nothing to prevent our believing that the apostolic commission recorded in St. John xx. 19-23 was delivered to women as well as men." Why, then, call it the *apostolic* commission? "In the parallel history (St. Luke xxiv. 33) we read that the two who came from Emmaus 'found the eleven gathered together and them that were with them.' It seems impossible to argue that the last words (τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς) were meant to exclude women. . . . With Bishop Westcott and Dr. Hort we venture to think that the great commission was given to those who were representatives of the whole Church, and among those representatives we have every reason to think that women had a place."

Now it is perhaps meticulous to remark that St. Luke speaks of the Eleven, whereas, according to St. John, only ten of the Apostles were there. For we may remember that St. Paul (1 Cor. xv. 5) writes that "He was seen of Kephas, then of the Twelve." This was evidently the same meeting as St. Luke describes, because the latter tells us that those from Emmaus "found the Eleven gathered together and those with them, saying, 'The Lord is risen indeed, and hath been seen of Simon.'" The mention of Simon in one place and of Kephas in the other identifies the two accounts, and exact numbers are obviously not a strong point with these early writers. But what is noticeable in St. Paul's statement is that *only* the Twelve are mentioned, and nothing is said of any others.

It is the same in St. John's narrative, the only narrative where the great commission is recorded. He says it was given to "the Disciples." And it must not be thought that "the Disciples" is a term of general complexion. It is the name which St. John, who never speaks of "Apostles," yet gives to the Apostles throughout his Gospel, as, for instance, when he mentions our Lord's washing "the Disciples' feet." And that the Apostles are here meant may be further inferred from the opening greeting: "As the Father hath sent (ἀπέσταλκε) Me, even so send (πέμπω) I you." They are henceforth "the sent," and so the name of "Apostles" becomes their common designation in the Acts of the Apostles.

It would appear then that the commission was not given "to those who were representatives of the Church" in general, but to the apostolic company in particular. If others were present, as St. Luke says, it was not given to them, but in their presence. This agrees with the view that has been generally held previously, though it excludes Bishop Westcott's contention that "it was the commission of the Christian Society, and not of the Christian Ministry." In the one case it is the ordination of the Apostles to their priestly or episcopal office, and does not apply to women; in the other case, as stated by the Bishops, it may apply to women, but does not confer the priestly office at all. It may be added, as further confirmation of the view here taken, that such bestowal would have been absolutely out of harmony with Jewish custom and prejudice, which our Lord at other times was wont to respect.

As for the gift of Pentecost, while it bestowed powers necessary for the execution of the office, and apparently on women as well as men, it no more conferred ordination than its later echoes did, as heard in the cases of Cornelius, the Roman centurion, the Samaritan converts, the believers at Ephesus, and the Corinthian community.

We come next to the evangelistic charge. It is to be found, though with some difficulties of reconciliation in regard to locality, in St. Matt. xxviii. 16-20, and St. Mark, or St. Mark's continuator, xvi. 14-16. And in both passages "the Eleven" alone are specially named. "Again," say the Bishops, "we are led to conclude that the evangelistic charge was delivered to a company which included women. The words of the Evangelist (St. Matthew) are: 'But the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw Him they worshipped Him; *οἱ δὲ ἐδίστασαν.*' The natural meaning of the last words is 'but others doubted.' Others, then, we infer, besides the Eleven, were present; and if others, then we may say with great probability that women were among them. This probability is immensely increased if we identify, as there is strong reason for identifying, this appearance of the risen Lord with that of which

St. Paul tells us (1 Cor. xv. 6), the appearance to above 500 brethren at once."

This conclusion of the Bishops, therefore, depends upon the meaning of the above clause. And the meaning of this clause is best arrived at by the aid of illustrations. In St. Matt. xxvi. 67 we read: "Then did they spit in His face, and buffet Him; and some (οἱ δέ) smote Him with the palms of their hands." Here we have different portions of the same group: "Some buffeted Him, others (οἱ δέ) smote Him with their palms." And we see that in the first clause οἱ μέν is omitted. And this is quite usual in Greek literature. Thus, Xenophon, *Hell.* i. 2, 14: "The Syracusan captives ran away by night and departed to Decelea, but some (οἱ δέ) to Megara;" or, "Departed (some of them) to Decelea, others to Megara." *Anab.* i. 5, 13: "They ran to their weapons, but some (οἱ δέ) stood still, not knowing what to do;" or, "They ran (some of them), but others stood still." We infer, then, that where οἱ δέ occurs under these circumstances by itself, either οἱ μέν is omitted in the preceding clause, or the mass act in the way predicated, while some (a minority) act differently. Accordingly, St. Matthew's meaning will be, either that "they worshipped Him, but some of them doubted" (A.V.), or that "they worshipped Him (some of them), but others doubted." In either case the Eleven alone are intended. And this is borne out by the corresponding passage from St. Mark, where it is said that "He (Jesus) was manifested to the Eleven, and upbraided their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they did not believe (had not believed) those who had seen Him after He was risen." After which He gives them the evangelistic charge. This statement also suggests another sense for the disputed words: "When they saw Him they worshipped Him, but some (*e.g.*, Thomas) had doubted," or, "though some had doubted," or, "some having doubted." But, whichever way we turn it, the words refer to the Eleven alone, and to them alone is the charge declared to have been given. If others were present, as is quite possible, nay, if the 500 brethren were all there, it only follows that the charge was given in their presence and hearing, and by no means that it was given to them.

W. S. Wood.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER

INDEX OF VOLUME I

JUNE—DECEMBER, 1920.

PAGES

ADVERSARIA Exegetica 83, 143
Anglo-Catholics and Episcopal Authority 339
Apostles, The Teaching of the Twelve 250
Article VIII.: Its Provisions and Safeguards 121
Atonement, Recent Work on the 222, 265
Authority in Religious Belief 316
Bancroft and the Divine Right of Bishops 28
Baptismal Regeneration, An Ancient Egyptian Foretaste of the Doctrine of 134
Barnabas, The Epistle of 250
Barnabas, Hermas, and the Didache 317
BERNARD, J. H., Review of: Harris and Mingana, The Odes and Psalms of Solomon 288
BEVAN, EDWYN, Review of: Wilson, Christ's Thought of God 168
Biblical Studies 110
BLACKMAN, AYLWARD M., An Ancient Egyptian Foretaste of the Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration 134
BURY, J. B., Review of: Freese, The Library of Photius. 174
Captives, The 346
Catholicism, Tendencies of 251
Christian Socialism. 316
Christian Use of Old Testament in the Present Day, The 318
Christian East, Stories from the 122
Christ's Thought of God. 168
Church and Social Service, The 57
COLLINGWOOD, R. G., What is the Problem of Evil ? 66
Review of: Matthews, King's College Lectures on Immortality . . . 299
Conversion and Modern Psychology 327
COOKE, G. A., The Law and the Prophets 75
Christian Use of O. T. 318
COOPER, JAMES, The Preliminary World Conference on Faith and Order at Geneva 281
Correspondence 233
Credentials of our Communion, The 1, 59, 187
Cuddesdon, Conference at 315, 339
Dionysius the Areopagite on the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology . 164
DITCHFIELD, P. H., History and Folklore in Genesis 257
Divinity of Man, The 178
Divorce, Christ's Teaching on 95
Documents Illustrative of the History of the Church 117
Drama of England, The Contemporary 311
Education, A Short History of 184
English Religion, Varieties of 55
Erasmus and Luther: Their Attitude to Toleration 105
Evil, The Problem of 177
Evil, What is the Problem of ? 66
Fletcher of Madeley 18
FLETCHER, J. S., Review of: Janet Trevelyan, A Short History of the Italian People 349
GASELEE, STEPHEN, Review of: James, The Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament: Their Titles and Fragments 48
Genesis, History and Folklore in 257
Geneva, The Preliminary World Conference on Faith and Order at . . . 277
God and Personality 40
Heaven, The Delightful Joys of 186
Henry the Sixth 313
Hexham and its Abbey 53
HOSKYNS, E. C., Adversaria Exegetica 83, 143
Immortality, King's College Lectures on 299
"In the Spirit" 38, 93, 162, 235, 284, 346
KNOX, WILFRED L., Tendencies of Catholicism 251
Anglo-Catholics and Episcopal Authority 339
Lambeth Conference. The 211
Reviews 238, 301, 355

PAGES
Land of the Ever Young, The 363
Law and the Prophets, The 75
League of Nations, A Handbook to the 115
League of Nations, The Responsibilities of the. 115
LIGHTFOOT, R. H., Review of: J. M. Shaw, The Resurrection of Christ . . 353
LOCK, W., Review of: Parry, The Pastoral Epistles 171
Lollard Bible, The, and Other Mediæval Biblical Versions 246
Lost Apocrypha of the Old Testament, The. Their Titles and Fragments. . 48
MAY, G. LACEY, Fletcher of Madeley 18
MCNEILE, A. H., St. Paul in Relation to Our Lord 9
Discussion on: Charles, Christ's Teaching on Divorce 95
MCNEILE, E. R., Lambeth Conference Review 307
MILNER-WHITE, E., Prayer-Book Revision 123
Review of: Murray, Erasmus and Luther: Their Attitude to Toleration . 105
Ministry of Women, The 355
Moral Theology, Some Principles of 317
Miscellanea 35, 90, 159, 233, 283, 345
Mother of God, The Most Holy, in the Songs of the Eastern Church . . . 181
MOZLEY, J. K., Recent Work on the Atonement 222, 265
MURRAY, ROBERT H., Survey of Recent Political Philosophy 149
Old Testament Study for Teachers and Students, An Introduction to . . . 113
PAGET, MRS. H. L., Lambeth Conference Review 355
Palmer, Sophia Matilda, Comtesse de Franqueville, 1852–1915 183
Parables of the Kingdom, The 180
Parson, The Old-Time 247
PASS, H. LEONARD, The Credentials of our Communion 1, 59, 187
Pastoral Epistles, The 171
Philosophy and Theology, The Relation between 196
Photius, The Library of 174
Political Philosophy, Survey of Recent 149
Prayer-Book Revision 123
Purton, The Story of 52
RASHDALL, H., The Relation between Philosophy and Theology 196
Religion is, What 248
Religious Conversion and Modern Psychology 327
Reunion, Principles of 345
Reunion, The Problem of 182
Russian History, Introduction to the Study of 249
St. Luke: The Man and his Work 114
St. Paul in Relation to Our Lord 9
SCHARLIEB, MARY, Lambeth Conference Review 301
Science and Life 119
SELBIE, W. B., Lambeth Conference Review 243
Select Passages illustrating Commercial and Diplomatic Relations between England and Russia 250
SELWYN, E. G., The Lambeth Conference 211
Septuagint, A Handbook to the 179
Sir Hobbard de Hoy 119
Solomon, The Odes and Psalms of 288
Spirit, The: God and His Relation to Man 54
Spiritual Freedom or Catholicity 121
Spring-Time and other Essays 56
TAYLOR, A. E., Review of: Webb, God and Personality 40
Rolt, Dionysius the Areopagite on the Divine Names and the Mystical Theology 164
Theology as an Empirical Science 99
THOULESS, ROBERT H., Religious Conversion and Modern Psychology . . 327
Review of: Macintosh, Theology as an Empirical Science 99
USHER, ROLAND G., Bancroft and the Divine Right of Bishops 28
Valley of Vision, The 185
Westminster Commentaries: Jeremiah 111
WILLOCHRA, BISHOP OF, The Preliminary World Conference on Faith and Order at Geneva 277
Winchester Cathedral 51
Winchester Cathedral Close 51
Women and the Apostolic Commission 358
WOOD, W. S., Lambeth Conference Resolutions on the Ministry of Women . 358
ZANZIBAR, BISHOP OF, Lambeth Conference Review 238